I and Mine

By

Acharya Mahaprajna

Translated by

R.P. Bhatnagar
Formerly Professor and Head
Department of English
University of Rajasthan, JAIPUR

JAIN VISHVA BHARATI INSTITUTE
(DEEMED UNIVERSITY)
LADNUN-341 306 (RAJ.) INDIA

Preface

The relation entailed in the expression 'I and my mind' throws up many ideas Can the 'I' or one's self (ego) be explained without taking the mind into consideration ? Is it not true that the mind itself deeply involved with its own inventions is creating and explaining the 'I'. Is the intellect not a section of the mind ? Is extrasensory knowledge real ? There are plenty of such discussions and for thousands upon thousands of years they have been repeated in the same language The knowledge of an average man occurs outside the limits of indirect experience. Therefore, the questions mentioned above have never been properly answered. The solution to these questions lies in steadying the mind This very state is called self realization

The experience made after the mind has been dissolved does not constitute knowledge acquired through the ear It is the kind of knowledge which comes from the depth of consciousness out of reach for the mind Knowledge acquired through the senses and the mind cannot exceed the limits of those instruments But is knowledge limited to the scope of these instruments ? Had it been so, scientific instruments would have been useless. Even the reach of the mind and that of the senses are different from each other. Had it not been so there would have been no ascending order in the stages of evolution. Whatever has become known to man in thousands of years is nothing more than a drop as compared to the ocean of the unknown. Without crossing that ocean, to aver that 'it is like this' (इदमित्थमेव) means denial of the unknown How can any metaphysician agree to do so ?

The three stages of consciousness—sensory, mental and intellectual—are tangible and perceptible, but the transcendental or trans-sensory stage is not tangible and perceptible It is not so to that part of man which is made up of senses, mind and intellect Therefore, even though being inseparable from consciousness, I am divided into outer consciousness and inner consciousness In spite of being

intangible, I am divided into two forms—the visible and the invisible. This dichtotomy can end only with the help of philosophy

Philosophy is transparent, univeral, tangible knowledge. Being not an intellectual exercise, its reach far exceeds that which is possible for the intellect. The visible and the tangible present no problems, problems abound within the limits of the invisible and the intangible The formulation of philosophy are beyond the reach of the senses, mind, and intellect That is why denying then gives a sort of easy, natural feeling, which is not there is accepting them. One can have a clear understanding of problems by comparing the knowledge and kinesis arising out of instinctive human nature and those of Indian philosophy

	Instinctive knowledge		**Philosophical knowledge**
1	Belief in the visible world	1	As compared to the visible, belief in the invisible world.
2	Belief in the present life.	2	As compared to the present life, belief in eternal life
3	Intellect as final authority	3	Philosophy as final authority
4	Belief in sensory experience	4	As compared to the sensory, belief in trans-sensory experience
5.	Belief in truth known through the mind.	5	Belief in truth known through the soul
	Instinctive kinesis		**Philosophical kinesis**
1	Attachment to sensory objects	1.	Detachment from sensory objects
2	Attachment to the transient	2	Attachment to the perennial
3	Indulging wants	3.	Restraining wants
4	Letting oneself loose towards the outer world	4.	Letting oneself loose towards the inner being
5	Socialness	5	Individuality

I will present questions posed above in the context of the distant realm of philosophy, in the language of 'mineness' (अहं) and I will answer them too in the language of 'mineness' (अहं) Readers should not confuse it with my ego (अहं) They should understand how much more subtle, effective and potent the philosophical personality of a man is than his intellectual personality Peace results only from this understanding.

Acharya Tulsi planted the seed of spirituality in my inner consciousness. It has fructified in the form of philosophy or direct experience. That is why I give greater importance to direct or visible truth than to that derived from hearing, thinking or reasoning. The competence and skill needed for awakening the inner experience are not found in accepting what others say and making them accept what we say That day will be a great day of religious achievement when we offer the pride of place of philosophy.

Some parts of the present book are based on my discourses. 'Sixteen maxims of Mental Peace'—this series of discourses was conducted by me in *Anuvrat* Camp at Delhi in 1966. Muni Shri Chandji has compiled them Elsewhere also his compilations are there at some places I have received the cooperation of Muni Shri Chandji and Chandan Mal 'Chand', M A. in the form of their brief notes, in re-writing the discourses on 'Religion in the Context of *Anuvrat* ' The present book has been edited by Muni Dulahrajji I express my hearty thanks to them

Acharya Mahaprajna

Contents

I. I AND MY MIND

II. A RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION

III. SIXTEEN FORMULAS FOR MENTAL PEACE

I

I and My Mind

1

I

"I am an ascetic I enjoy the boundless grace of Gurudev Shree Tulsi My asceticism is not bound by inert rituals My faith is in that asceticism which is not lifeless I have faith in that asceticism which is a veritable ocean of joy I have faith in that asceticism which has a perennial source of energy.

I follow a tradition, but do not treat its dynamic elements as static. I derive benefit from out of the scriptures, but do not believe in carrying them as a burden

The insight I have gained does not admit of separation between the past and the present The two are integrated in it. In my consciousness there is no bondage of 'yours and mine ' It is free from it My spritual practice does not 'worship' truth, it subects it to minute surgery

The only mission of life is boundless curiosity to know truth. That is precisely my asceticism It is not an external accoutrement Like a seed it is sprouting out of my inner being.

There was a time when Indians actively pursued the method of directly experiencing the truth The present-day Indian's mentality is afflicted by indirect experience. Both his thinking and interpretation are borrowed. This is a self-evident proof of its imbecility I have but one wish—initial, medial and final—to save present-day India from the affliction of indirect experience and to lead it towards direct experience."

2

Questions Assailing the Mind

It was night time. I was sitting in a lighted room. All of a sudden the lights went off and dense darkness ensued In a few moments the electric current returned and the light was restored Within ten minutes this hide and seek between light and darkness must have taken place at least three to four times It set me athinking Light is artificial not natural It is darkness that is natural. There is no power-house to generate it nor does it need a switch to be turned on. On the contrary, for light one needs a source of power, a transmission system, a lamp and so many other things

Once again I thought how prejudiced man is He runs after that which is not natural and runs away from the natural. Take the case of forgiveness and anger. It needs almost infinite striving to inculcate that former while the latter is so spontaneously generated Is not then anger natural and forgiveness unnatural ?

I further introspected as a monk I am used to giving religious discourses and every time I ask people to cultivate forgiveness and to eschew anger I have discoursed on this theme times out of number and yet to no avail, since I know that people are still much more prone to anger than to forgiveness.

I once came across a man who was a victim of excessive fear. He would be afraid of not only thing present in the immediate environement but even of imaginary objects Even while he was alive he would imagine death and be afraid of it. I did my best to convince him of the futility of the fear of death since death was inevitable and death unaccompanied by fear would be much less painful Again, all my pursuasion failed So once again the conclusion is inescapable that fear is natural and fearlessness unnatural.

In the long history of man there have been innumerable sages They have challenged lust and have vowed to keep it away by not giving it any entry in their thoughts We, however, know that none of them

could conquer lust. The rigorous self-control and its sustained practice so essential for observing *Brahmacharya* would lead anyone to infer that it is unnatural while its non-observation is natural.

With all these thoughts assailing the mind I was completely out of my depth. How is it that things we feel naturally inclined towards, we regard undesirable and those that we are disinclined against, we regard desirable ?

We have a natural liking for the things we feel the need for, as is the case with food and water No one has ever bound a person under oath to eat food or drink water, nor has anyone ever told another person that if he did not eat, he might have cause to repent. No sermon is needed to induce people to indulge these primary needs. People like eating and drinking simply because doing so make them happy and not doing it would incapacitate them

Now what would you say, if I were to ask you if you ever felt the need for religion and if you felt miserable in its absence, and further if its absence would render you in any way handicapped ? The answer would be obvious. If the need for it were as imperative and obvious as that for food and water, there would be no place for religious precepts It would be unnecessary to bind people under oath to follow religion. Thus, we inevitably conclude that following religion is not a natural urge Only the demands of the body and the desires of the heart are natural In fact it is this union of physical and emotional needs that characterizes life In other words, life can be defined as the fulfilment of natural needs Can the need for religion be a part of its definition ?

All this leads me to believe that notwithstanding the herculian efforts made by countless people over the centuries to turn the unnatural into the natural, nothing could be achieved. The physical appetites and urges are even today as compulsive as in the remote past Fasting, moral awakening, and *Brahmacharya* are as stubbornly eschewed as ever before. We are as irrevocably wedded to showing hatred and anger as our primitive forebears and as vehemently opposed to peace, love and geniality as they

Shall we then admit the futility of light—the helpnessness of the sun against darkness ? Obviously, no. Nature loves polarity. Both light and darkness have to co-exist. Likewise, it is futile to blame mediums for not completely erradicating disease. The being of one necessitates that of the other.

3

Relative Norms of Naturalness

One evening even as the sun was about to set the sky became suddenly overcast Droplets began to fall and soon it started pouring accompanied by flashes of lightening and hailstorm I noticed that a monkey sitting in a nearby tree was shivering with cold My mind wandered in the remote past and the thought came to me that man too would have met the same fate had it not been for his inventiveness, courage and valour Creative man has always held out a challenge to the vacuity in nature The skyscrapers symbolize his victory over nature

Another incident I witnessed was that of milk boiling over a stove Everytime the temperature rose the milk boiled over and the young woman beside the stove sprinkled a few drops of water and the effusion subsided It happened several times before the pot was taken off the stove Another trail of thought started. Man always challenges nature, as in his attempt to defeat the milk's effusion Does that mean that his creativity and courage cannot be kindled without challenging that which is natural ? An inner voice seemed to tell me that without such a challenge there would be no creativity

Both the events reveal the same truth—only that is natural in the physical world that has not suffered any intervention from and has not faced the challenge of man's creativity In other words, it is creativity that divides being from becoming It is of the essence of man to bridge the gap between being and becoming. To be human is to prefer becoming to being, that is why the eternal human refrain has been

Man ! Be ever a creative adventure !

Once I was sitting on the seashore and was intensely watching the sea's spirit hidden somewhere in its fathomless depths. The undulating waves came right up to my shadow in the sea waters and receded. Are sea waves not natural ? A sea without waves is like sunrise without daylight.

Analogically it is impossible to concede the presence of emotions and deny the existence of sexual desire, anger and fear. A mere denial of this fact will not be a guarantee of spiritual exaltation. I am interested in unravelling the truth and not in covering it up

I would like to recall another incident. Wrapped in a blanket I was sitting in a corner of a room. The windows were closed but one of the doors was open. Icy winds from the north had chilled the air. The newspaper in my hand announced the complete freezing of the Arctic My imagination became active and I saw that there were no waves in the frozen waters. I wondered if I should accept the fact that the nature of the ocean had undergone a basic change. And by admitting it would I be able to uncover the truth ? The absence of waves bore the same relation to the frozen ocean as did the presence of the sun of the daylight Should I liken the body to an ocean and the passions of sex, anger, and fear to waves, and admit the fact that the freezing of the former has resulted in the cessation of the latter. In fact these two things are but two styles of stating the same fact With the intensification of the process of concentrating on the centre of the inner being, 'endocentering', the passions calm down and bow out. At this point, I am not going to discuss the above process but am merely hinting at the fact that man's courage and creativity simply inhere in his ability to change that which is natural. And it is for this reason that the eternal voice keeps echoing in the atmosphere

Man ! Be ever a creative adventurer !

It is in this creative adventure that man's greatness lies and the importance of the former is solely due to its power to change that which is natural An enlightened and morally valorous man is never satisfied with 'being' and is always actively pursuing 'becoming'. The change of the natural into the unnatural and vice versa is fully due to this active pursuit. Naturalness is a context-bound experience and its context-free experience is beyond our capacity for direct apprehension

On being questioned why he was scratching his skin and wounding himself, the man who was doing so replied that it gave him immense pleasure to do so. I was not convinced by his answer How could scratching the skin be a source of pleasure ? However, a little deeper thinking made me agree with him Only he can know the pleasure of scratching who is infested with the itch-causing bacteria. Being myself free from them, how can I experience the pleasure of scratching ?

The same is true of a person deriving pleasure out of copulation

because he too is infested with the desire for sex.

Could then one say that eating to satiate hunger is pleasure ? Not to my way of thinking. For me hunger is a disease. Hunger is nothing but abdominal pangs It being a daily occurrence, we do not regard it as a disease Only infrequent afflictions are treated as a disease. A man taking medicine because he is suffering from fever cannot be said to be deriving pleasure. It is merely an antidote to the disease. On the same analogy I would like to assert that eating also far from being a pleasure is merely an antidote to a disease. If it is true that man is attracted towards pleasure, it is equally true that very often he mistakes displeasure for pleasure

With the advances in the development of consciousness such a misapprehension starts disappearing. The norms governing our munderstanding of the natural and the pleasing also undergo a change A new centre of attraction comes into being. The same eternal voice strikes the ears.

Man ! Be ever a creative adventurer !

Such an adventure brings about a change not only in the apprehension of the physical objects but also in the world of consciousness If we predicate naturalness to what *is*, to 'being' our development will be hindered With the growth in development the context-boundor relative norms of naturalness also change By embarking upon such a course of development, man overcomes the aggression of the immediate and heads towards the understanding of the remote and the invisible Ultimately he can attain a stage when his real nature having been revealed to him he becomes totally immune to other forms of naturalness It is this self-realization the direct apprehension of which becomes an everlasting experience

4

What is Truth ?

You are surprised that I do not believe in the soul and I am surprised that you believe in it even though you do not know what it is ? Have you ever seen the soul ? Can anyone believe in it without seeing it ? Seeing is believing. One who knows does not believe in it and the one who believes in it does not know it.

In spite of your belief in the soul could you see any light ? You could have seen it if you had known the soul's existence I am convinced that there is no soul When did this conviction plunge me into darkness ? I would have been plunged into darkness only if I could have known that the soul does not exist In you case as well as in mine it is just believing, and believing is not knowing. Let me tell you a story.

The mistress told the servant to go and buy some butter oil from the market He evinced unwillingness as he was afraid of going out in the dark The mistress insisted on his believing that there was nothing like fear The poor fellow walked down a few steps but soon returned. The mistress repeated her prescription, but the servant despite his effort could go no further On being asked to go a third time he rushed downstairs and in a couple of minutes came back with a full container and put it beofre his mistress. She said, "Have you brought the butter oil ?" The servant answered, "Yes, I have."

She smelt it and burst into anger, "Is this what you call butter oil ? This is donkey's urine." Quick came the reply from the servant, "Why don't you believe it to be butter oil ?" She retored, "How can I believe something that is not butter oil to be butter oil ?" "This is precisely the question," observed the servant. "When I feel afraid how can I believe that there is nothing like fear ?"

This is argument, counter-argument. What else can there be when it comes to believing ? Arguments, counter-arguments, counter-counter-arguments and so on until the belief is shattered. I believe that religion is not a natural need of life, you believe that it is

so. In both cases it is a question of belief. What the truth indeed is neither you know, nor do I.

Whenever I think of the instruments or means of knowledge I feel that our philosophers are utterly confused Their idea of the truth is no better than a mirage. They say that the truth is transcendental and cannot be pursued by the senses Let me, however, tell you that we have two means of knowing the truth : the senses and the intellect.

For, if there are no means of knowing what the truth is, how could the philosophers know that the truth is transcendental ? Some of our philosophers regard all those things illusory which are grasped through the intellect For them only those things are real which are beyond the reach of the intellect. Knowledge gained through the senses and the intellect, they argue, being prone to doubt and error, can never be true and authentic The function of the eye is to see but it fails to perform it under adverse circumstances caused by either haze or distance The rays of the sun falling on the mother-of-pearl creates the illusion of silver Excess of phlegm makes everything taste better and to a man bitten by a snake even the bitterest thing tastes sweet Everyone of the five senses is governed too much by external circumstances to be capable of perceiving the truth Likewise, the intellect is also full of uncertainty and mis-apprehension. On the other hand, it is equally true that to earn admiration a man can go even hungry and also that meeting abuse by abuse and looking down upon others afford great pleasure.

Such is their line of reasoning and on its basis they assert the impossibility of knowing the truth through the senses or the intellect Again, it is the same conviction which denies the reality of the happiness derived from these two sources But I would like to ask them if they know of any unfailing norm by which the reality can be correctly assessed.

We simply do not have the means of knowing any transcendental reality even if were to exist. The only instruments of knowledge we have are the senses and the intellect Is it not a blunder to treat the available instruments as undependable and, therefore, the knowledge revealed by them as false and to believe in the means which are non-existant ?

5

The Question of the Non-manifest

Only a few hours earlier the sky looked like a canopy bedecked with a million shining stars. But now all have disappeared and the sun is shining bright All the minor lamps have extinguished. Only the sun is shedding light. But is this the truth ? Superficially, yes. In reality, however, all the other planets and stars have not lost their existence, they have merely been overwhelmed by an intenser light

Can existence ever cease to be ? Can anything existing today be ever regarded not existant either in the past or in the future ? Both existence and non-existence are eternal The same tree which was completely bare in autumn has put on rich foliage in spring and with the onset of autumn will once again shed all its leaves. But being bare and putting on leaves do not constitute the tree's existence. They only denote that the tree exists Likewise, life and death are merely expressions of our existence They are not existence itself Manifest is merely the surface expression of existence as the ripples on the bosom of an ocean The senses and the intellect can apprehend the water's existence only through the medium of the ripples. It is for this reason that their perception of truth is not simply the direct observation of reality.

Sieving through the window lattice the rays of the sun were lighting up a myriad particles of dust which only a few moments ago I was not able to see. Again, the taped music is being played and I am listening to a familiar voice which only a little while ago I was not able to hear. When the abstract changes into the concrete, the hidden becomes manifest and the remote becomes close, then the invisible turns into the visible and the inaccessible becomes accessible

What I can see in the light I cannot see in the dark. The microscope reveals much more than the bare eyes do. If I carry this argument to its logical conclusion, I can say that the best of microscopes cannot reveal what inner enlightenment can.

Any developmental sequence must have an ultimate stage. There must be, accordingly, an ultimate means of knowing the truth It is this which is in Indian philosophy called para-knowledge. On its basis it can be said that the visible, the concrete, the manifest and the close are as true as the invisible, the abstract, the hidden and the remote When I use my imagination the truth appears to be endless and boundless. On the contrary, when I use my senses and the intellect and stop the play of imagination, the truth like a closed room appears to be both placid and limited. Within that room I become surrounded by indirect apprehension of the truth

One day I was intently gazing at the sky My philosophical disposition reminded me that the sky was limitless. Right then my practical sense opposed it and maintained that it was limited. I was confused. Was the sky limitless or limited ? I kept wondering for a long time Suddenly I heard the air-raid siren. Anti-aircraft guns started firing The peaceful atmosphere turned tumultuous I was naturally curious to know why it happened so ? I got the answer that the enemy aircraft had penetrated our airspace and they were being shot down.

Our ancestors knew the boundaries of the earth and they also got acquainted with the boundaries of the sea. Both the earth and the sea have boundaries and so it would have appeared natural to those ancestors to regard them as limited. But they could not conceive the sky being limited. It was this chain of thought which reminded me of the *Nyaya* system of Indian philosophy. In it I came across terms like

Ghatakash
Patakash
and *Grihakash*.

It further lent support to the fact that the sky was indeed limited. If I had believed in logic, I would have been satisfied by this finding. But I wanted to experience the truth and so plodded on My desire to reach out for the philosophical truth freed me from the confines of logic and I saw that the sky was limitless. Limitlessness represents the sky's existential reality and my philosophical understanding of it. Limitedness is the modification of the sky's existential reality by my ego—the outcome of superficial knowledge. The limitation is man's own creation So long as there is a pitcher, it can enclose space within it. Once the pitcher breaks, the enclosed space disappears and with it my perception of limited space also vanishes. Then I see space as space, boundless and infinite. Its limitedness was a mere illusion, not the truth.

You will now ask me, 'How can the space inside the pitcher be

fictive ? It holds liquid. Will open space be able to hold it ? Fictiveness cannot belong to something that holds water.'

My answer is that I see two levels of reality—one imaginary and the other born of change The projection of the space within the pitcher on to the open space is the imaginary level of reality. But the perception of confined space within the pitcher is the imaginary level of reality born of the latter's transfer from the open to the enclosed state. The former is existential untruth, the latter is existential truth. Misleading perceptions are not uncommon. It is the case when a bird pecks away at its own reflection in a mirror. It is misled into regarding the reflection a rival bird. Likewise, how often does a man get frightened by his own shadow ? It is again an illusion that makes him treat the latter as his own enemy Both the bird and the man illustrate the difference between darkness and light. So does my recognition of a voice heard from behind a wall. In each case there is some screen that keeps out light. Believing (the reflection to be a rival bird, the shadow to be an enemy, the voice to be of a known person) has its base in darkness (the presence of a screen keeping the light out); knowing is direct apprehension of reality I know that the sun exists, but I believe in the existence of the legendary golden mountain Sumeru A direct contact with existence results in direct knowledge, contact through some medium leads to indirect knowledge. The former is knowing, the latter is believing As light spreads, believing gives way to knowing. The object of Indian philosophy is to move from believing to knowing and with the direct experience of existential reality that goal is achieved. Whereas existence is independent, the knower of knowing or believing, utility or usefulness requires the combination of the knower and the object My existence is not the result of others experiencing it They experience it because I exist I experience myself; that is why I exist

6

Question Troubling the Intellect

I have been a student of philosophy. I used to think that without it truth could not be known. Having read both eastern and western philosophy I am convinced that it is nothing more than an intellectual exercise. It cannot be denied that it is only through intelligence that man's development can take place Science has made unimaginable progress Space flights are now a common feature. With clock-work efficiency one space ship takes off and another lands after completing the mission Anti aircraft guns pinpoint their targets in the distant skies and bring them down Pilotless aircraft do the intended bombing through remote control. The example can be infinitely multiplied Can anyone who is wide awake deny the truth of these achievements of human intelligence ? And yet our philosophers keep harping on the theme of the visible being unreal, and the invisible being real. That which is accessible to human intelligence is according to them not real, while that which is beyond its grasp is real.

The human intellect is a wonderful actor It keeps playing diverse roles. Even though it is the prime agent of knowledge it has taken a back-stage position and has fancied a line of thinking totally unrelated to man. I keep wondering whether that man was truly intelligent or unintelligent who said that real knowledge begins where the reach of the intellect ends. If he was intelligent, he displayed the power of intelligence in making that statement And if he was unintelligent, then he had not basis to make the statement Whatever one asserts—whether in favour of something or against it—one does only on the basis of one's intelligence All proof or disproof has its origin in our intelligence. From whatever point, therefore, one might begin, one gets back to recognising the supremacy of the intellect By denying the importance of the intellect we get into an unenviable position where the very basis of accepting or rejecting a proposition is knocked out

When I look at my body, my natural understanding tells me that it

is in essence physical and material, something different from me, for I am not matter but soul, not physical body but pure consciousness. The body is ephemeral. I am immortal. Belief in the body-mind dichotomy is regarded not only as crucial to philosophy but is also necessary for ultimate deliverance.

Every time such natural understanding gets active I repeat the formula of body-mind dichotomy. But there are times when I think to the contrary. Can the soul have a separate existence from the body ? If yes, is it outside the body or inside it ? Since no consciousness can exist outside the body, external soul-consciousness is simply beyond the pale of experience. If the soul is inside the body, what enables us to experience it ? At any rate who has drawn this eternal dividing line between the soul and the body Is it not merely subservince to formal logic which dictates the contradictoriness of that which lacks consciouness and that which has it Some of our philosophers have likened the body to a chariot and the soul to a charioteer The chariot is for everyone to see and be sure about What is in doubt is the existence of the charioteer Those who affirm its existence have not seen it, nor have those who negate its existence seen or perceived its non-existence. However, the battle lines have been drawn with the two armies—the believers and the non-believers—confronting each other and armed with their own darts of reason. Who will win is yet to be seen.

7

My Being

Laid up with flu, I was lying on the ground It was a small house in a small village with open skies My mind was absolutely free and unfettered Right in front of me was a tree. Everything shone bright in the mid-day sun I first looked at the tree and then at the sky The former had a miniscule existence against the latter Small but limitless They sky is limitless both spatially and temporally. And in terms of time the tree too is limitless Not even an atom of the tree can ever be destroyed It is bound by the philosophical principle that says

> *Anything existent in the present was so in the past and will be in future too Anything non-existent in the past can never be either now or in the future*

The sky and the tree have absolutely no idea of their being or not being and yet their existence is unhindered and limitless If every single atom that exists will forever be, then how can I doubt my own existence When even an atom cannot defy the universal principle of everlasting existence, how can I be an exception. A little more thinking made me wonder why it is that man alone should doubt his existence He has a more developed consciousness than that of a tree and, therefore, entertains doubts about it, furthermore his consciousness is not as developed as that of a yogi and, therefore, he cannot understand its infiniteness. From both angles he is a loser.

Some truths in this world are palpable, others are subtle, and yet others are abstract and intangible I can apply palpable and subtle means to know the first two types but I have not means of knowing that abstract and the impalpable truths I can see a mango, taste it, smell it, and touch it simply because it is a palpable reality. In the case of an atom, none of my senses can perceive it but a microscope can reveal its existence On the other hand, there is no microscope through which an abstract truth can be perceived and existence is one such abstract and impalpable truth It is not amenable to sense perception and therefore defies all

attempts of knowing it. If my existence were not a part of me I would have resorted to its description in words that people who claim to have apprehended their existence have used. Innumerable people have described in language their belief in the eternity of their existence and have at the same time the ephemeral character asserted of the physical body. If it were merely a matter of belief I could subscribe to it too, but the whole thing undergoes a change when one wants to know and not to believe

The senses, the mind, the intellect and the language are all means of indirect experience, whereas knowing results in direct experience. Since none of the means of indirect experience are of any avail when it comes to knowing, I despair of researching on my existence

Fortunately the picture is not altogether despairing, since the illumination of the awareness of my existence does come out through the senses, the mind and the intellect to operate in the external world, its ultimate return to the inner being notwithstanding Being geared to external perception, I can see the outer goings on But being devoid of the introspective life, I am totally ignorant of the inner processes This explains why I have no knowledge of my existence

Once my guru asked me to block the flow of my consciousness into the external world As soon as I did it, I found my self face to face with my essential being It was no longer the case of there being any duality of my being and its awareness in me It was one integrated self-awareness as an objective truth devoid of all subjectivity. It is in this context that I have questioned the competence of the intellect and have refused to accept its assertion of the dichotomy between body and soul

Prior to the above state I was engaged in intellectual pursuits—discoveries made with the help of the intellect Then there was a duality of being and its awareness. I was the researcher and the awareness was the object of research Intellect had even created this division. As soon as I prevented the flow of awareness from passing through the intellect, my being and its awareness lost their duality and along with that difference between the researcher and the thing researched on also disappeared

Just as the old, traditional lamp has given way to the electric bulb resulting in the devaluation of the former, intellect will also lose all its value the day we become acquainted with the power of natural awareness.

Intellectualism has made the indirect appear direct simply because

the senses do not have the power of direct apprehension. They have limited powers of perception and those too of the externals. Further, they cannot but distort perceptions Objective truth can be experienced only through medium-neutral awareness. That alone constitutes direct apprehension where all constraints of time and senses are overcome Past and future lose all meaning in such a state, for each succeeding moment and my being cohere perfectly well The two thus absolutely reconciled, I find that my being has become truly dynamic

8

Questions Troubling the Senses

I read a small book called *Terah Dwar* (Thirteen doors) in childhood. It said whatever man eats, drinks, dresses, wraps up, hears, sees is all matter All things visible and usable are matter. The seer and the user is spirit

A little thought revealed that the spirit neither eats nor drinks, neither dresses nor wraps up, neither hears nor sees Nor does the body, for that matter, for it lacks consciousness Having ruled out both the body and the spirit, the question arises : Then who is the agent of all these activities ? Philosophers reply that it is neither body nor spirit but a combination of both, which further complicates matters For once you brings in the spirit you have to believe in the whole rigmarole of rebirth, heaven, hell, God, the *karmas* and their bondage, deliverance and so on. By believing in all these things man has literally handed over his present to the future, has made the visible and the immediate a prisoner of the invisible and the remote and has allowed his fancy to undertake flights into the unknown Not surprisingly, truth remains evasive.

There is a story that proves how ignoring the present for imaginary gains proves disastrous.

Long ago a farmer from Marwar travelled to Mewar There he drank sugar-cane juice, ate jaggery, sugar and other sweet preparations. He was greatly fascinated by this land of sweets, for back home they grew nothing but millet. He bought sugar-cane seeds and returned home There, despite wise counsel to the contrary, he insisted on planting sugar-cane without even waiting for harvesting the nearly ripe millet crop. He had his way but since the place had scarcity of water all his efforts went up in smoke.

9

Curiosity about Happiness

Right in front of me is a coconut tree—a straight trunk, some leaves and a few coconuts. This is all I can see. But is this all that there is to it or is there something more to it—like the seed not visible and the sap which too is invisible ?

Our senses cannot go beyond the visible, physical world The invisible is simply beyond their reach Being unknown to the senses the invisible can neither be affirmed nor denied by them

Visibility and invisibility are relative concepts Having come some distance from where I was, I cannot see the tree now. There is a wall between me and the tree Any hindrance can make the visible invisible for the senses Now I am far away from the tree and even though there is no hindrance I cannot see it. Distance too makes for invisibility Again, what the microscope reveals the naked eye cannot perceive What I see is the gross physical world; what enables me to see it is itself gross and physical The subtle truth can be perceived only by the subtle sight that can establish contact with the former and can uncover it

Unlike the tree, I cannot see awareness, for the latter is abstract. The tree can be out of sight and distant but not awareness, because I, that is the manifest form of awareness, serve as a link between awareness and subtle invisible universe made of infinite atoms.

Both awareness and atom are devoid of hunger, they don't eat They do not speak either But I feel hungry, I eat and speak because I am situated at the meeting point between awareness and atom.

The visible world, where happiness and unhappiness prevail, also belongs to the same meeting point Pure awareness is neither happiness nor unhappiness, neither bondage nor freedom; it is merely an experience of existence When awareness is at the above-mentioned meeting point, it is susceptible to happiness, unhappiness, bondage and freedom That is why on attaining purity it comes to be relatively treated

as a state of happiness and freedom. This is the point where existence is at its zenith and where all the constraints of the senses having been overcome, there is an experience of infiniteness and unspeakable, limitless joy.

It was observed earlier that it is ordinarily futile to barter away the present happiness for an imaginary one. But it is not so when what one leaves is of an inferior order as compared to what one sets out to seek. Sensual pleasure is so easy, natural and agreeable that ordinarily no one wants to relinquish it He alone can leave it who has felt a compelling attradction towards pure existence

Having attained to the state of parasensual joy, people have known the inferiority of sensual pleasures. Its inferiority lies in the following three aspects .

1 It is variable.
2. It is interruptible
3 It is transient

The parasensual joy is invariable, uninterrupted and permanent and so it is more dependable and certain, the reason why sensual pleasures appear so tangible is because they are related to physical instruments On the other hand, parasensual joy appears so difficult because it is related to introspection. Once this right understanding grows, the concept of joy undergoes complete transformation.

10

The Mind's Unsteadiness

An educated mind can alone be religious To say that an uneducated mind can be religious is both contradiction in terms and a self-deception Centuries have passed and yet man has not been able to find ways of steadying the mind simply because he has not understood the above equation

The very first step to being religious is conquest of the mind Keshi asked Gautum how he had vanquished the foes and conquered himself. Gautum replied

> I conquered the mind and the enemies—anger, pride, deception and greed It resulted in overcoming all the five senses In this way I conquered all the enemies as well as myself

One who does not know how to conquer the mind cannot overcome the passions and the senses, and without overcoming them no one can be truly religious, even though he might follow certain rituals and perform ceremonial acts

What is mind, and what constitutes its unsteadiness ? Mind is one of the doors that opens up awareness which as we have seen is infinite to attribute unsteadiness to the mind is a mistake, for unsteadiness belongs to the body and to breathing So long as we do not master the art of disengaging the body from unsteadiness and do not know the profound truth about breathing, we will continue to regard the mind unsteady The day body, speech and breathing become firmly steady we will realise the futility of calling the mind unsteady

11

Contexts of Mental Development

Mind is a part of our awareness It has a role both in our inclinations. To know one's mind is in some to know one's self To be acquainted with its workings is a sign of alertness. Thus, knowledge of the mind can be of immense use Moreover, it can also enable us to develop its potentiality, power and mode of working

Mind is half-way between the senses and self-awareness. The former have contact with the external world and awareness has the inner being as its centre. Mind analyses and experiences the output of both.

According to psychologists genetics and environment are the two means of mental development The first is a gift of nature, the second is generated by practice Similarly, poets are also of two kinds—those who are born as poets and those who cultivate poetry. This is true of all fields of human endeavour When Lord Krishna was asked how to control the mind, he replied

> Practice and detachment are the two means of controlling the mind and both require effort for neither is endowed by nature

The sage Patanjali has also expressed the same opinion. Anything achievable through human exertion entails practice. Development requires sustained practice

The great preceptor Hem Chandra has also shed light on the question of mental development In this respect he mentions four contexts ·

1 Being instable or distracted (*Vikshep*)
2. Rising and falling or ups and downs (*Yatayat*).
3. Clinging or union (*Shlisht*)
4 Complete absorption or dissolution (*Suleen*).

Vikshep

At this stage the *sadhak* (seeker) starts meditating in order to understand the mind. He comes to know that it is instable. It is an illusion that prior to meditation the mind appears to be stable. The truth is that without meditation the consciousness of the true state of the mind does not down. All the underlying instability of the mind is revealed only by meditation. This is not difficult to understand. Normally we are too inured to mental instability to be aware of it.

Yatayat

If distractions and instability assail the mind when one starts meditation, it should not worry the seeker It is like the last flicker of the lamp. When the ant puts on wings it presages death.

Swami Vivekanand faced a similar situation and complained about the storms of passion in his mind to his *guru*, Ramkrishna Paramhans The latter acclaimed it as a very good sign and said that it showed how the mind was purging itself of inner filth that lay congealed in it. He advised Vivekanand not to suppress the rising passion

Do not stop the mind from wandering Just as sudden brakes applied to a speeding car or an attempt to sharply bring down high temperature can prove disastrous, any suppression of instinctual drives can also be harmful Leave the mind free to empty itself, to run itsself out. By adopting the above procedure a stage comes when there is alternation between a stable state and an instable state of the mind This is what meant by *Yatayat*

Shlisht

Cohering or clinging merely denotes a stage when mind is tuned to or united with the aim in view. Constant practice makes the two almost inseperable.

Suleen

It means complete absorption in the aim almost like the dissolution of sugar in milk. Both maintain their independent existence and yet a certain unity is achieved In Yoga terminology it is called *Samarasi bhav* or *samapatti*, i.e., a completely similar mental and emotional orientation In this context the seeker and sought become totally fused into each other

Patanjali has put it somewhat differently. With the mind wandering under *vikshep* there is no joy possible. Under *Yatayat* some joy of a transensual nature is possible. Under *shlisht* there is immense joy. Finally under *Suleen* there accrues perfect joy or bliss

I read an article last year which spoke of two closely juxtaposed glands—one of happiness, the other of unhappiness When excited the former creates infinite joy, that is, immune to all external circumstances. The latter, on the other hand, becomes the source of pervasive unhappiness.

Our sustained endeavour to seek spirituality excites the gland of happiness, so much so that even a momentary set back results in unhappiness. Because of our abysmal ignorance we are totally unaware of the boundless ocean of joy surging within us

12

The Individual and Society

I am thinking of a tree and a leaf, a sheet of water and a fish, a sea of water and a drop The leaf owes its origin to the tree and, therefore, cannot have an independent existence And though neither the fish nor the drop of water is born of the larger sheet of water, neither of these two can also exist independently since the fish cannot live without water and the drop cannot survive away from the larger sheet If one were to think of a suitable comparison between the individual and society on the one hand and any of the three dyads mentioned above, the closest fit of the former will be with the water drop and the sheet of water Both share categorial commonness The basic criterion determining the relationship between the individual and society is in essence a common or the same class.

There is a bond of unity between the individual society No unity is ever unprincipled or ungoverned by law In an atmosphere of total dependence on society the individual ceases to be an indepedent entity Where such dependence does not exist he can have a being of his own This kind of independence belongs to the world of spirituality

Money is both expendable and capable of being bartered for it is material This is not the case with spirituality If inheres or is centred in one's being and is altogether individual As lightening reveals visible things but cannot transfer its own light to them, spirituality too is not transferable even though it can benefit others Every individual is potentially great in terms of spirituality As fire is instrumental in spreading the scent of incense, one spiritual person can be instrumental in bringing about spiritual awakening in another, but spirituality basically remains totally individual

It is foolish to deny the existence of the individual in the name of society The latter can be the centre of activities, but not of awareness.

The individual in harmony with society generates strength, society in harmony with the individual proves beneficial By treating the two in isolation will be a travesty of truth

13

Plurality in the Midst of Collectivity

Superficially everyone strikes different from others, looked deeply no one appears different 'My competence is superior to that of other'—this thought carves me out as an individual, as a completely autonomous being

We make a great show of cooperation and sympathy as part of group living and pretend to share one another's joys and sorrows However, we remain disparate and many and refuse to have a sense of unity It is because of our 'maniness' that there are social mores and conventions as well as social norms Where there is oneness the need for these conventions and norms disappears. Moreover, we have no univeral criteria and norms. We simply apply our own to others

It is my multiple contacts with others that reflect as many images of mine into others' eyes. But surely this does not mean that I have multiple beings I know that I am one and this is also the truth The feeling of disparateness is at best an imposition; it is not a characteristic of my own being It is this imposed feeling whcih gives rise to mutual distrust and fault finding This feeling is caused by the awareness of the independence of one's being and by one's ignorance of others It is not individual independence but ignorance that one should get rid of Inadequate acquaintance breaks mutual misunderstanding True knowledge saves us from such a misunderstanding The feeling that we are different from one another is the direct result of our ignorance or lack of proper knowledge If we want to bring about social unity and cohesion it can be possible mainly through the removal of ignorance and wrong understanding

According to me mutual understanding and knowledge between individuals is perfectly possible. There are three obstacles or hindrances in achieving it . ignorance, distrust and self-delusion.

Some people believe that knowledge causes unhappiness. I will oppose them not by saying that ignorance causes unhappiness, but that

ignorance itself is unhappiness Similarly, some prudent people vehemently oppose the tendency to trust others I disagree Distrust leads to infinite regress Moreover, while unsuspecting trust may sometimes prove dangerous, there is nothing more dangerous than distrust The former can be dealt with by being alert, the latter is simply incurable. Again, one should not delude oneself into believing in the maxim, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'. My *guru* has taught me to treat the virtuous and the wicked alike. One might object and say how light and darkness can be equated. But wisdom refuses to accept the dichotomy At the bottom of all darkness lies light and all light is surrounded by darkness. My handling of both has a common aim—to free light from the covering of darkness

14

Am I Independent ?

I am not at all surprised at not being independent Not to speak of me, no one endowed with life is independent The vital breath is coursing through me and I am living Grain is growing and I am eating It is raining and I am drinking water My life-span depends on vital breath. Living means willing acceptance of all kinds of dependence

I see a lamp-stand and the lamp is giving light. It is doing so by being dependent on an earthen vessel, oil, wick, air and fire I see a seed sprouting It is doing so being dependent on a piece of fertile soil, water, sunlight as well as heat and air. Can the lamp be said to be independent in giving light or the seed in sprouting ? No one is free from the chains of time, nature of being, fixed order of happening, destiny and effort Consequently, no one is independent

There is a suspended cage with a parrot inside it. The cage is unlatched and the parrot flies away I ask myself why that innocent bird has left its home and gone away into a forest, why it has preffered the dry trees to the wholesome food consisting of dry fruits lying in the cage

An unknown voice answers . The cage means slavery How can a parrot used to unhindered flights into infinite space prefer the life of slavery ? It was interpreted by me thus . infinity is 'enclosed' by void, therefore enclosure abhors void.

Can water 'enclosed' by endless flow ever recognize a dam ? A dam represents water's helplessness. Water recognizes the supremacy of motion, therefore it abhors stagnation What I want to say is that slavery or bondage means a behind-the-scene confluence of indispensable dependence and dispensable dependence And independence means the remnants of indispensable occurrences of dependence How can anyone assert that man likes independence and does not like dependence, that he does not like walking on his feet so much as walking being aided by others ?

I see the highways of Delhi swarming with cars, with people in thousands moving about here and there They would not have sat inside their cars if they had been unaware of the power of enclosure. They know it very well that one can at best walk three to four miles an hour.

I would not have been a part of tradition if I had been unaware of the power of enclosure Tradition, sects, castes and nations—these are all enclosures, bounded and circumscribed. If they had not been powerful, they would have all vanished. But they continue to exist for the simple reason that electric current can give light only after being enclosed within a bulb A wind enclosed by clouds is more effective than that blowing in a clear sky A bullet becomes powerful only when it is fired from barrel An arrow becomes powerful only when shot from a bow

Man has accepted dependence not out of folly He is bound up with language and so is able to think and communicate He is bound up with senses and the mind and so is active He is bound up with hunger and so is engaged in professional activities All interpersonal relations are made possible through the body, language, senses, mind and hunger Their field of operation is society If the self had remained just self, I would have been fully independent A man with healthy legs does not need crutches My imperfections have inclined me to relativism What I want to say is that I am imperfect and for that reason I am dependent and since I am dependent I am enlightened by the question Am I independent ? He who is independent rises above He who is dependent goes down One who/that is attached or connected goes down, one not attached or connected rises upwards One who/that is light goes up, one who/that is heavy goes down A tumba (pot made from dried gourd) after being plastered with mud sank in water. When the mud plaster got removed it came up float on water Amoke rises precisely because it is light A stone falls down because it is heavy. Going up denotes dependence on lightness and going down denotes dependence on heaviness Attachment makes it possible to experience detachment and degradation makes it possible to experience exaltation

If there had been no darkness, light would not have had the importance it has Health, happiness and peace have value only when seen against disease, unhappiness and perturbation It means that that which is independent is beyond evaluation, which means that it is independent of time Since I am manifest, I am independent on time and therefore subject to the limitations of past, present and future It is possible for a man subject to limitations to ask if he is independent ?

The potter's wheel was a little while ago rotating under the impulse of his finger Now it is rotating as a result of the earlier momentum. Sometimes the motion is dependent on the finger and sometimes on the momentum All mobility is governed by some sort of independence

Once a controversy arose between a king and his minister. The minister said 'All people are working being dependent on their wives.' The king refuted it At long last the time to test the truth arrived. Two camps were set up The one meant for the supporters of dependence on wives was filled to capacity. The other had just one man When questioned by the king he said that he was standing alone because his wife had asked him to avoid crowds Thus there was not a single person in the whole town who was not governed by his wife Likewise, there is not a single individual in this world who is not led by countless expectations

Once I was sitting in the midst of wild kidney-bean plants. It was mid-day The sun was raining intense heat on the beans and pods were crackling With wonder in the eyes I saw the beans cracking and the pods leaping This leaping conveyed a feeling of the joy of freedom It taught me that the can accept its independence on the beans, if the latter is ready to let former go after it has ripened The fruit can accept its dependence on the stem provided the latter is ready to let the former go after it has ripened After the above discussion I am no longer seized of the question 'Am I independent ?' On the other hand, a new belief is growing that I am dependent so that I may become independent

15

The Starting Point of Nonviolence

I consider myself imperfect Despite that, I strongly feel like being perfect if someone points at my imperfection. For a moment the thought of imperfection vanishes Why does it happen so ? Perhaps because one who points at my perfection does so keeping in mind my perfection He has a certain mental image of my perfection and so he points at my imperfection If he had in his mind my imperfection and pointed at it, I would not forget that I am imperfect

I believe in nonviolence Occasionally I practise is also, but it would be sheer vanity if I were to think that I have ever imbibed nonviolence having completely vanquished the long-inhered instinct for violence All that I can claim is that I am following the path of nonviolence I would have answered the question—when and where will I reach ?—if I had been connected only with the present But it is connected with my past and therefore the utmost I can say is that I am going along the way to nonviolence

My dear critic, the only thing I can tell you is that I am not rigidly traditional I consider only those waters pure which are not still and I concede that water held still in a pit loses its purity

I do not subscribe to the mentality of remaining as I am or unchanged, for the simple reason that in it I see the germs of violence.

'I am imperfect and want to be perfect'—this alone is the starting point of my nonviolence The imperfect will turn perfect when what is ceases to be and what is not comes into being This is my self-criticism born of my own writing

16

The Meaning of Nonviolence

When I take an overview of my life I come down and tread on the earth, relinguishing the world of imagination. I find that one day I had resolved to follow nonviolence. At that time nonviolence meant to me not killing sentient beings and it was unthinkable for me to concede the possibility of violence despite non-killing of sentient beings.

Compassion to living creatures indeed carries a highly respected meaning It gives infinite joy to see the fulfilment of what one consider good and desirable From time to time I experienced such joy. But as I grew and came in contact with fellow seekers, I realised that my understanding of nonviolence was imperfect I grew restless to understand it in totality I came to realise that nonviolence meant not to be stung by the oppressive cruelty of circumstances There is no body in this world who would not be enraptured by favourable circumstances and hurt by adverse circumstances I felt one cannot follow nonviolence if chooses to swim with the current of circumstances. The delusion torn of favourable circumstances incapacitates conciousness, while the vexatiousness caused by adversity renders it blunt

Nonviolence is the independent state of conciousness. Whatever can be subdued by heat or cold (one condition or the other) cannot be independent Only that can be independent which cannot be subdued by anything at all. This is the light-house of my nonviolence now I am now more sensitive to living creatures' need for compassion and I feel the pangs of others' pain more sharply I would not have been constantly sensitive to others' plight if I had remained a prisoner to circumstances.

Circumstances do not always remain uniform. Conciousness reflecting these circumstances cannot also remain uniform Some people regard me practical, others do not Some people think I am spiritual, others think I am playing politics. There are many balances and as many evaluative criteria I am capable of being weighed, so I am weighed I am capable of being measured, so I am measured. My

nonviolence would have been the nonviolence of lifeless world of stones and my peace of mind would have been the peace of mind of the cemetery, if I had not been weighable and measurable My nonviolence belongs to the living world of conciousness and my peace of mind is one attested to hold in the midst of the rear of the battle It is testified by the fact that I fully examine the personality attributed to me by the evaluation of others, but finally recognize only that personality which is the product of self-evaluation My criterion too is my own. This is not the voice of my ego It is the awareness of my existence which is not countered by another existence This unopposed, unassailed state of existence alone is my present nonviolence.

Nonviolence has two dimensions, resistence (प्रतिरोध) and retaliation or countering (प्रतिकार) Violence too has these two dimensions Resistance is self-defence and retaliation is fighting the circumstances If nonviolence were to lose resistance and retaliation, its practitioner would become powerless and the balance of power would be in the hands of violent people

The misunderstanding of the common man about the nonviolence should be removed People should know that nonviolence is not powerless It has a much stronger power of resistence and retaliation.

One who believes in violence resists and counters it being influenced by it and having accepted it Violence on either side belongs to the same class Therefore violence does not end violence, it inflames it, it causes it successively

One who believes in nonviolence resists and counters violence by being uninfluenced by it—does it by rejecting violence Violence and nonviolence belong to different classes That is why nonviolence puts an end to violence—absorbs its recurrence The emergence of an independent consciousness constitutes the power of resistence of nonviolence and an expansive love leaving no room for bitterness is its countering or retaliatory power

I have an untainted attitude If I had accorded place in my mind to a consciousness enslaved to circumstances, my puissance would have been still-born

I have repeated the following maxim innumerable times . 'One who reacts and refuses to act courts defeat '

Expanding love is my action. In it lies the independent activity of my consciousness. Mortally struck by it violence meets its own death If I were to counter violence by violence, I would be reacting It will be reaction because it will be governed not by me but by the circumstances

facing me. Such a reaction does not strengthen me On the contrary, it robs me of my strength. It means my adversity becomes more lethal by drawing on my own strength. Can there be a better example of my foolishness than my strengthening the very thing that aims at making me totally impotent I have been benefited enough to be able to find my way out of darkness having been enlightened by the maxim, 'Circumstances gain strength in proportion to the loss of self-confidence.'

For many years I have been trying to ensure the drying up of the source of bitterness in me—the source which does not let happiness grow in me, in fact, which dries it up I consider having dedicated myself to the deity of nonviolence the day I realized the truth that bitterness returns and harms its source without reaching its target I am not baring my conscience I am trying to read it under the illumination of the above eternal truth He alone is above the polarities of happiness and sorrow who is immune to heat and cold He alone is capable of destroying bondage who is not awayed by circumstances. The world of image and its reflection is the world of reaction. In its dictionary the word *independence* is not found In it there is neither spontaneous activity, nor any outcome of one's own self; neither one's own power, nor one's own happiness Whatever there is is mere reflection and impression, just regret and ennui and it will stay there as long as the theatre of Violence continues to be the centre of attraction

17

The Intertwining of Nonviolence

Many a time I thought of uncovering myself, so that my colleagues could see my real self It is the cover that has created doubts about me in them They will persist as long as the cover is there Uncovering begets trust This world likes daulity It explains the creation of the cover. Doubt would not even have been born had the world been a straightfoward place without any bends and concealment

But the world likes daulity, it does not like uniformity That is why there are countless bends and hideouts. And bends and hideouts cannot but create doubt

Many a time I thought of lighting such a lamp as would enable my colleagues to see my real self It is the darkness that creates doubts in them Doubts will not be dispelled as long as darkness is there It is light that begets trust This world likes daulity That is why it has room for both light and darkness

Many a time I thought of destroying the Himalayan heights so that my colleagues could see my real self It is these heights that create doubts in them Doubts will not be dispelled as long as the heights are there. It is evenness that begets trust This world likes unevenness That is why it has built a high wall dividing two even surfaces

Many a time I thought of drying up the endless waters so that my colleagues could see my real self It is the depth of the waters that creates doubts in them Doubts will not be dispelled as long as the depth remains It is equal levels that beget trust This world likes daulity That is why it has created this deep gulf between two equal levels

Many a time I thought of giving up living in my mansion so that my colleagues could see my real self It is the wall's obstruction that creates doubts in them Doubts will not be dispelled as long as the obstacle remains Trust is born when there are no obstacles This world likes duality That is why mansions have been created If there had been open spaces, there would have been no distrust Distrust comes into

being wherever spaces has been enclosed.

I again thought wondering whether I was not being swept away by the currents of fancy as a rudderless ship is adrift.

I again thought wondering whether I was not flying in infinite space like a bird caught up in a cyclone

Is there an anchorage for my ship ? Is there any resting-place for my bird ? Are the acts of uncovering, light, absence of obstacle and evenness real ? Are they practical ? Are they vouchsafed to these marionettes ?

Many questions in quick succession came to my mind and then the infinite voices of my colleagues started ringing in my ears : they are unreal, impractical and impossible for these marionettes which move but not on their own

Those voices were very sweet. But I don't know why they did not fascinate me. To a man bitten by a snake, *neem* (Azadirachta indica) tastes sweet This is a contrariety but it is not untrue. How can I say that I was not a victim of a snake bite ? A man who has even a small trace of violence in him, whose mirror of mind bears even a tinted shadow, is not free from poison and to him *neem* must taste sweet If what tastes bitter to the rest of the world does not taste sweet to a man afflicted with poison, he must be considered unconscious He has got into an irretrievable condition I thought I had poison in me when the voices of spirituality felf bitter by the world strated sounding sweet to me And the taste of sweetness gave me the assurance that I was not an incurable patient.

My doctor had not treated anything as incurable His declaration is This medicine of mine is for all those who are afflicted with poison, no matter whether they are awake or asleep, active or indolent, mobile or static, with or without inflammation, dependent or independent.

My doctor had such an impact on me that I could not satisfy my colleagues. My beliefs are becoming increasingly problematic as I come more and more poison-free.

I had assumed that sugar is sweet and *neem* is bitter Today it has become problematic Is sugar sweet ? Is *neem* bitter ?

I had assumed that fire is hot and ice is cold. Today it has become problematic. Is fire hot ? Is ice cold ?

I has assumed that something was light and something was darkness. But today a question is being raised from somewhere : Is darkness indeed darkness ? Is light indeed light ?

These questions have agitated my mind My stupefied consciousness

has awakened Now I see; I do not hear Now I know, I do not assume I see that all things consonant with people's selfishness are sweet for all of them and all things dissonant with people's selfishness are bitter for all of them Nothing is absolutely sweet or bitter for anybody. That which is sweet is also bitter and that which is bitter is also sweet.

I see clearly that everyone is aggressively assertive towards authority that lacks power and very meek towards powerful authority. No one is absolutely assertive or meek One who is assertive is also meek and one who is meek is also assertive

I see clearly that those endowed with sight see light everywhere, while those deprived of sight find darkness everywhere. There is nothing like absolute light or absolute darkness That which is light is darkness also and that which is darkness is light also

This experience of nonviolence has enabled me to realise that the path that gives entry is also the path that leads to the exit

Nourished by the same truth once I wrote The steps that take up are also the steps that bring down and likewise the steps that bring down are also that steps that take up These are not two different sets of steps

18

Relative Truth

I see the picture of an old man emerging before my eyes He was very healthy and strong in his youth He was very active and equally proficient in his work He was a centre of attraction because of both his physical eyes and his inner light Now he has grown old His beautiful body now looks like a corpse His beautiful hair has greyed His healthy body has become diseased His eyes are not longer attractive His organs of perception have become ineffective and his organs of action have become powerless He is no longer proficient in his work, nor is he now known for inner wisdom he feels organised through the remembrance of his past His unhappiness lies in the present but is not an outcome of the present It has been derived in the present but has its connections with the past He would not have been so unhappy if he had not been healthy and beautiful in the past, if he had not been so energetic and effective in the past, if he had not been a centre of attraction in the past He would have avoided unhappiness, if he had not connected the past with the present through memory—if he had been free from the knowledge of his past and present identity

The period of time when I was the centre of attraction is now over Now the wheel of time has put me into a new time-span In it I have lost the capability of being the centre of attraction. Thus he would not have been unhappy only if he had the right knowledge of the change of circumstances suffered by the same entity. If he had the right knowledge and philosophy, he would have avoided unhappiness Lord Mahavir had alluded to this tendency to let the present be influenced by the past as *Naigam Naya* (differentiating among the past, present and future).

Once a farmer said to his wife, "I am going to bring a buffalo." She said, 'You are welcome to do so but I will give the cream of its milk to my mother ' The farmer said, 'How can you do so ? I buy the buffalo and its cream is enjoyed by your mother ?' The debate became heated and they started quarrelling One of the neighbours came and broke all

their pitchers saying the farmer's buffalo had grazed in his field and eaten away all his grass 'But I have no buffalo at home,' said the farmer, 'so where is the question of my buffalo eating away your grass ?' The neighbour remarked, 'Why this quarrel then between you and your wife even when there is no buffalo ?'

This is an instance of the present being influenced by the future and again it exemplifies a part of the *Naigam Naya.*

I see the cycle of integration and disintegration in the change of state of matrial objects. What is an ocean if not an integration of countless drops ? And what is a drop if not the disintegration of an ocean ? Integration denotes expansion It has its own utility, for ships cannot float on a drop of water Disintegration denotes diminution. It too has its own utility. The beak of a bird cannot take in a whole ocean Therefore both the ocean and the drop are real

Cloth has its own use It gives protection against heat and cold. Thread has its own use It makes knitting possible Their functions are not interchangeable Therefore cloth as well as thread is real Conceding the reality of these two relative reals is explained by Lord Mahavira's *Samgrah* and *Vyavahar Naya* (synthetic approach and analytic approach)

I see a beautiful garden containing scores of attractive and pleasing rose plants Their multi-coloured flowers are very lovely They are exuding fragrance All visitors to the garden view them with greedy eyes.

After a few years, I find the garden withering. The gardener had stopped watering the plants and so they have dried up Now everyone views them with pitiful eyes

The past glory of rose plants has turned unreal Now their destruction has become real This present reality exemplifies Lord Mahavira's *Rijusutra Naya* (straight and direct approach).

Once a seminar was in progress One of the speakers was rejecting the scriptures I thought to myself that one body of knowledge is approved as well as rejected by another body of knowledge Had it not been for verbal knowledge neither approbation or rejection would have been possible Could that speaker reject the scriptures without resort to the use of words ? Really speaking, he was not so much rejecting them as he was imposing his body of knowledge on the ancient body of knowledge Such an imposition is made possible by a partial view Nothing like the rejection of ancient texts would be possible if over a passage of time a change of relationship between sounds and their sense

is conceded. 'Delhi' is a word It denotes a certain territory called by that name. But its meaning changes if one thinks of Delhi in the past, Delhi in the present and Delhi in the future. Delhi under the Congress rule is different from Delhi under the British rule and should another regime come in the future, Delhi under that regime would be different from Delhi under the Congress rule. If we consider its minutiae, both yesterday's and tomorrow's Delhi will be different from today's Delhi.

This knowledge of verbal meaning coming under the influence of the passage of time is Lord Mahavira's *Shabda-Naya* (verbalistic approach).

Today we were wandering in the Mandor garden with Acharya Tulsi. Facing us was a hilly ascent and there was a flight of stairs for going up Going up the stairs Acharya Shree remarked : This is of course an *Udyan* (garden). My mind was overwhelmed by the meaning of that nominal An *udyan* is a garden laid on a highland. There is a close relation between the subject and the predicate There is no predicate which may echo two subjects Different etymologies yield different meanings This is explained by Lord Mahavira's *Samabhirurh Naya* (the standpoint in which a difference of meaning is supposed to exist in the difference of gender, synonym and number)

There was a government officer who used to light two lamps—one with oil bought with his own money and the other bought with government funds, the former for doing his personal work and the latter for official work There are many similar instances. Fo example, there was another officer who would use the official car for official work and the public transport for personal work A man is a government officer only when he is doing official work. This is Lord Mahavira's *Evambhut Naya* (actualistic approach)

We live in a world of relative facts and therefore their interpretation is very valuable for us By evaluating it we can solve a number of problems The origin of all problems lies in pertinacity and in imposing one's opinions on others. Pertinacity gives rise to untruth and it in turn creates problems. The relative outlook is an enormous contribution of Lord Mahavira to Indian thinking It develops the habit of eschewing pertinacity. Eschewing pertinacity brings one is contact with truth and truth provides answers to all problems.

II

A Religious Revolution

1

Three Diverse Ways of Looking at the Same Thing—Religion

I see a picture emerging before me. It has three aspects First, a man was performing religious rituals I endearingly asked him why he was doing it. He spontaneously replied, 'It will ameliorate the hereafter' Second, there was a man who used to do business. Despite many efforts he did not get success. He grew disappointed He started spending all his time in religious rituals. One day I asked him why he spent a lot of time in those rituals. He replied, 'I am unhappy in this life because of bad deeds in the previous birth. I am doing those rituals so that at least in the next birth I may not have to suffer so much unhappiness.' Third, there was a man who was very quarrelsome But he was equally a strong advocate of religion I was at a loss to understand how pugnacity and religiosity could go together However, he regarded himself religious and others also called him religious One day I asked him what his being religious could mean when he was quarrelling all the time. He replied respectfully, 'I have got into the habit of quarrelling and can't get over it. This life will run its course the way it is doing Let me by practising religion at least hope for a better hereafter.

If we put all the three aspects together, the integrated picture suggests that religious people are not as much concerned about ameliorating the here as they are about the hereafter. They are not as desirous of improving the present life as they are of improving life in the next birth. And not apparently unreasonably so. For they believe they are helpless about what is happening in the present life, since it is the outcome of the bad actions of the previous life Their next life would be good in proportion to the good they do in this life.

Their idea of a good life is availability of abundant wealth, a nice mansion, a good family, plenty of domestic aids and luxury goods. Inauthenticity, falsehood, breach of trust etc. are not opposed to their

idea of a good life. They are not ascetics After all they have to do business for earning a livelihood Can one make a living through authenticity, truthfulness etc ? Such arguments never allow them to be righteous Let me explain their concept of religion by quoting an incident

One, day, a new face was sighted in a seminar. The participants present there asked the stranger out of curiosity : 'What is special about your life ?' The stranger replied, 'My special quality is that I never neglect or abandon religion.' He felt all the more enthused when the people looked at him with eyes full of wonder He added, 'When required, I drank liquor and gambled, but never gave up religion. Hunger is an actute problem and to satiate it I sometimes stole and even robbed, and yet did not abandon religion Who does not have a weakness of mind ? I too indulged in prostitution out of weakness, but did not relinquish religion. Occasionally I committed murders also out of rage, but did not jettison religion ' Keeping his eyes closed he went on indulging in self-praise Then one of the men asked him, 'What is your religion ?' The stranger replied with a sense of pride, 'I never ate anything at the hands of untouchables I faced countless hardships but spared no efforts to remain steadfast in religion '

One can find hundreds of similar incidents and stories. They present before us religion as conceived by the common people. Of course there is also no dearth of people who would disapprove of such a concept of religion. But man revels in the outbursts of his emotions he has not left even the field of religion untouched by the above tendency As a matter of fact, religion's true character lies in calming not in exciting passions But has such a true religion ever been practised ?

A person who deems himself religious is as full of fear, grief, hatred and agitation of mind as is an irreligious person If those lecturing on the equality of all sentient beings are discriminatory and if those lecturing on the common fatherhood of God are cruel, it is natural to conclude that philosophy is confined to the intellect and lecturing only

I failed to understand why even those people do not hesitate to indulge in evil who believe that the spirit exists, that it is reborn, that good results in good and evil results in evil Then how can one distinguish a believer from a non-believer ?

2

Religion and Institutionalized Religion

Some people believe that religion is always useful because it is perennial Others regard it useless. They believe that it has become out of date, has put on layers of covering and , therefore, it is no good sticking to it Shall we support the opinion that religion has outlived its utility, or, shall we support the opinion that religion is relevant in the present circumstances ?

When I consider the above question, I distinguish between two types of religion . institutionalized religion and religion as such. Religion is endless, boundless and open as the sky When it is confined within small limits, it becomes institutionalized religion (sectarianism). No one has a proprietary right to the unbounded sky. But the same space, when enclosed in rooms and house, gives us a proprietary right Unbounded space can take in all, but room-bounded space cannot do so There the entry can be prohibited The case of religion is no different. It is boundless truth · accessible and acceptable to all But it has been compartmentalized and confined. Thus its doors are no longer open to all Closed-door religion becomes bounded. Hunduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, etc are examples of closed-door relgion Deep dividing lines got drawn and many enclosures built around such institutionalized religions Men get divided "Only those following my religion are proper people, others are not"—such feelings get ingrained in the mind It is for this reason that institutionalized religion has not much benefited the people, nor is it doing so at present. Therefore, some people basing their opinion on the accomplishments of institutionalized relgion have tried to deny its need. They have tried to banish it from their minds holding it to be a hindrance to the fulfilment of basic human needs. Is it correct to do so ? I shall not debate its corectness or incorrectness at length I like brevity To state briefly, food, clothing

and shelter are the basic needs of life. In ensuring their supply does not lie the success of the achievement of life's object. It lies in investigating and worshipping the truth. Generally, man is faithful This is all right, but he sould also be a surgeon Being faithful to the body does not mean that ulcers and abscesses should not be subjected to surgery If faithfulness and readiness for surgery had been balanced, the body of religion would not have become diseased

Why was the sprit of religion forgotten ? Why did the body of relgion get diseased ? By analyzing these questions deeply I find that the spriti of religion got forgotten due to a faith long dependent on scriptural texts and its body got diseased due to a faith detached from the readiness for surgery

Today every religious person swears by scriptures, be they the Gita, the Agams, the Pitaks, the Quran or the Bible Do religious people never feel inclined to question the accuracy of things written in the scriptures thousands of years ago ? Have we properly and correctly understood scriptural texts ? Have we personally experienced the truths contained in them ? Is it possible to have the waters of the river of truth flow beyond our reach without experiencing or using them ? Poetic fancy can be repeated in the language of poetry but spiritual truths cannot be repeated in the language of the scriptures By exalting the virtues of drinking liquor (*somras*) one cannot add glory to the scriptures. Similarly, one can derive no benefit merely by lauding nonviolence while indulging in strife and fighting I often ask people Is nonviolence good ? Is nonpossession good ? Do you have any experience of them ? The answer I got is that so far as experience is concerned they haven't had it ever. I then ask them, 'Then, how can you say that nonviolence and nonpossession are good ? Prompt comes the reply 'We believe it because that particular scripture says so ' This compels us to conclude that it is such religious people that are responsible for robbing religion of its lustre and for enfeebling the glory of nonviolence and nonpossession. Whenever mere repetition of scriptural texts increases and personal experience decreases, the scriptures gain in lustre but religion loses it On the other hand, when personal experience increases and the repetition of scriptural texts decreases, religion gains in lustre and scriptures lose it Those who want to see religion enjoying prestige and honour are revealing new truths Some of them are presenting new facts The present is a scientific age, it is an intellectual and rational age. It has fewer people reposing faith in the dark past and the unknown future There are far more people who

believe in the present. Therefore, religion will have to be presented only after it has stood the tests of the present

The present is not an individualistic age. It is an age of socialism. New communal experiments are being tried. Earlier, people used to live in small villages Today we have metropolitan cities like Calcutta and Bombay In the past people used individual modes of transport—camels and horses. Nowadays collective modes of transport like the train etc are used Collective trade, collective agriculture and collective residence are all transforming individual living into communal or collective living The present generation does not want to treat religion also on an individual basis I want to state that religion is communal or collective despite being individualistic From the point of view of practice it is individual, but in terms of its resutls it is social Religion while benefiting the individual also benefits society Those favouring religion in individual behaviour but disregarding it in social behaviour knowingly or unknowingly want the fruit of their worship to be enjoyed by themselves and the ill effects of their lack of authenticity to be visited on the whole society How ridiculous ! Truly speaking religion should *result in the individual containing his vices within himself, but* spreading his virtures to society Individual worship has no direct bearing on society, it has a direct relation with individual conduct It is impossible for a man of religion to behave badly. Fiery sparks cannot come out of the currents of water Bad currents coming out of a religious person can never help sprout religious faith in other people

Let the value of religion be assessed in the background of the above thinking If one wants to ensure the survival and attraction of religion it will have to be proved that relgion is not an invitation to evil but a constant fight against it

Let us give only secondary importance to individual worship and primary importance to conduct and behaviour. By reversing the above order, we reverse the flow of religion too. I am not discarding worship I am only proposing its proper place. I am just saying what Kalidas meant when he said that the worship of the revered should not commit any transgression.

Mere worship is a shallow effort to attain religion Real depth is reached when worship gets combined with spirituality and morality. There was the case of a man engaged in digging a well The water level was at a depth of fifty feet He dug a pit five-feet deep without any results. Then he dug a second pit and a third pit and another pit, until he had dug ten pits Yet there was no positive result He sat down

thoroughly disappointed Likewise, a shallow effort at attaining religion also causes disappointment If at one place only the pit had been dug up to the depth of fity feet, water would have been reached. The fountain of joy requires the combined depth of worship and conduct. In Ayurveda, *yogendra ras* without gold is ineffective. Similarly, worship loses its utility in the absence of righteousness

Today there is an imperative need for the emergence of a religion which is not contingent or denominational It should be all encompassing like the sky and yet no one may claim proprietary rights to it In my opinion relgion *is* only when it does not belong to individuals as individuals

3

The Soul of Religion—Unity or Equality

I see on the one hand the enormous universe and on the other hand a minuscule man I also find that present-day thinking is inclined towards the enormous, the aggregate All things are conceived on a large and comprehensive scale. But despite it, problems have not mitigated The problems of the gigantic universe are the same as those of the individual. What is there in the human body is there in the universe too and vice versa I see no reason to doubt its veracity We become partial and one-sided by being concerned with either the individual or the group This disease of one-sidedness is rampant everywhere A comprehensive or many-sided viewpoint dictates that we do not forget the individual while being concerned with the group and be aware of the group while being concerned with the individual.

One of Lord Mahavira's principles is 'He who knows one, knows all, and he who knows all, alone knows one.' We are at a loss to find solutions to the problems because we do not know even one It becomes essential to know all other things in order to be able to know an atom. Full knowledge of an atom is not possible without understanding its similarities and dissimilarities and presence or absence of relatedness with all other things. That is why in analysing an atom one comes to know of countless laws of the universe.

These days we have got obsessed with extension. We have no liking for concision. The Upanishads declare 'He who sees manyness is heading for a condition worse than death ' Any attempt to know manyness, that is, society, without trying to know the one (individual) is truly disastrous.

The problems of the individual can be divided into three classes . 1. physical, 2 social, and 3 mental or spiritual Economic power or the power of money came to the fore ever since the beginning

of civilazation in order to fulfil the physical problems relating to the basic needs of life. But the advent of economic or money power gave rise to another problem : robbery, plunder, snatching and looting. The strong started terrorising the weak. State power came into being in order to solve the above problem.

Even State power, which flourished to resolve problems arising out of economic power, could not remain untainted. A need for moral or religious power was felt to curb the arbitrariness of state power Besides, religious power is also an answer to the inherent anxiety and uneasiness of human beings.

However, despite the emergence of all these authorities or power-centres, individual problems remained unsolved The individual is even today poor and deprived. He is bereft of social cooperation. His awareness is blunted. What is the cause ? According to me it is not hard to find. The power centres created for solving individual problems have themselves turned into problems. I recall a tale contained in the puranas. By performing penance a mouse earned the blessings of Lord Shiva and turned into a cat. He did so out of the fear of cats but still the fear of dogs continued Through successive course of penance he kept changing from cat to dog to leopard to tiger and finally to man One day Lord Shiva asked him, 'Are you now free from all fears ?' He replied, 'Even by becoming man my problems are not over, for I am suffering from fear of death I may, therefore, be favoured and turned into a mouse again Lord Shiva once again blessed him and he returned to the origional form of mouse

Modern man should also be thinking of reverting to his primitive state, because in his case too all new solutions turn into problems Take the case of money It was intended to solve a major problem but today it has become one of the greatest problems. At one place we find tons of money, and at the same time at another place people are crying in agonizing penury. Money is less a means of fulfilling human needs and more a status symbol State power, originally intended to provide order and security, find itself incapable of doing it, since it has lost internal discipline Religious power capable of inspiring State power to practise internal discipline is itself embroiled in its own affairs. Religion no longer has internal strength It has become an instrument of State power There could be no greater contrast than that between the illustrious character of religion in the past and its lack-lusture present-day form It has all come about because people have reduced religion to mere rituals Is it graceful that religion should seek the protection of State

power ? It is truly a case of glowing fire having been covered with ashes.

In its radiant form religion stands for the experience of unity and harmony. We are witnessing a new thinking at present, which can even root out religion. People wonder whether religious worship practised for thousands of years has succeeded in solving the human problems. They have in fact come to believe that there has been no success at all. I am afraid I cannot agree with them. Even then I shall not try to evade their question. Anyone who uses their language of thinking can say that relgion has failed to solve human problems. People want religion to help you accumulate wealth, cure diseases and win legal suits. They do not use religion to solve problems which it is meant to solve. They would do well to seek the help of a skilled businessman, doctor or lawyer. The solutions of the problems they seek have no direct relation with religion and yet most people are pursuing the above course.

We have cared only for the form and the name of religion. It is one of our weaknesses that our eyes and ears see and hear oly external objects. No wonder we give importance only to names and forms.

We do not know how to respect the holy life of an ascetic. We only know how to respect the formal appearance. A vaishnava does not revere a Jain ascetic and a Jain does not revere a vaishnava ascetic, the simple reason being our reverence for form and ignorance of type or content The content gets lost in the blaze of appearance. Our sight is fixed on names and forms, we cannot look beyond them.

It is said that religion was responsible for wars. I have always refuted this contention. The main proposition of my argument is that wars were caused not by religion but by its form and name. The soul of religion is unity. No was can be fought without destroying the spirit of religion The Vedanta propounds the principle that all sentient beings originate from the same source Jain philosophy also asserts that all sentient beings are alike Could human beings have fought each other if the above feeling of unity and harmony had been practised by the people ? Could one individual have exploited another individual ? Could one man have hated another ? Fighting, exploitationa and hatred are thriving on the basis of manyness and discord One person works tirelessly the whole day and earns some money. The entire family shares it, but no one complains. A cultured husband does not castigate his wife by telling her that he earns while she sits back at home. There is a feeling of unity in the family and so no occasion for complaint arises. Complaining is the outcome of disunity. Does any government employee receive kickbacks from his son ? Does a shopkeeper deceive

his son ? Bribes and deceit are found only where there is no unity.

Feeling unity and harmoney with everyone is the spirit of religion. The greater the identity one feels with others, the more the religiosity one imbibes Thinking on these lines convinces me that we have merely touched the veneer of religion but have never felt its inner core. What we have seen are the crabs. shells and oysters in the sands of the sea beach, not the pearls lying at the bottom of the waters. What shouls we do them ? This was precisely the question raised by Tolstoy

Vigorous efforts are needed to wriggle out of the complex situation, for they can change the circumstances. But Indians have come to posit too much faith in fatalism. Millions of people are leading a life totally dependent upon fate Countless people are getting trapped. No fierce earthquake or terrible thunder has done greater harm to Indian life than the twin beliefs that things are predetermined and that what is predestined cannot be avoide Who can support a person devoid of belief in the efficacy of his own efforts Let me recount a story, at once vital and heart-rending.

A thief was busy stealing. People in the house woke up and raised an alarm The neighbours too woke up. The thief took to heels He was running hotly pursued by the people The police too began chasing him. He got tired but there was no place for hiding Right then he saw a temple of a female deity in the jungle and he got into it

The deity was greatly revered in that region Thousands of people used to worship her There was a widespread rumour that no one returned unsatisfied from the temple Having reached the courtyard of the temple, the thief felt a bit assured. He folded his hands before the deity and spoke in a devotional voice, 'O Mother ! I seek your protection Please save me ' The deity was pleased by his humility and said to him, 'Shout when people come to arrest you and no one would be able to come in front of you '

The thief · 'Mother, my throat is parched out of fear and I can't shout '

The deity 'Look straight inot the eyes of your captors and they will not be able to arrest you '

The thief · 'Mother, fear has petrified my eyes, I can't see straight at anybody '

The diety 'All right, close the doors of the temple and you will escape apprehension.'

The thief 'Mother, what you say is fine, but due to fear my hands refuse to work and I can't close the door.'

The deity : 'Then go and hide yourself behind my idol.'
The thief : 'That is fine too but fear has rendered me motionless and I can't walk.'
The deity said angrily . 'Then I can't help such an impotent and useless fellow '

We need renewed and vigorous effort for achieving success. Let us embark on one such effort and first of all refine our concepts relating to religion and form new relations and bonds.

The end-result of economic power is glory and opulence. Along with it one should be sensitive and sympathetic It will curb both exploitation and accumulation.

The end-result of state power is authority Along with it one should have self-discipline. It will prevent irresponsible exercise of authority.

The end-result of religious power is purity. It should be coupled with morality A religious person has his gaze fixed only on the hereafter and rarely on the now and the here One is afraid of spoiling the hereafter in the absence of religion, but there is no fear that unethical behaviour is bound to spoil the hereafter. People feel remorse and consider the day waste if they are not able on that day to count the beads on a rosary, but they neither have remorse nor consider the day wasted if they indulge in unethical behaviour This is because they have convinced themselves that a few minutes' religious ritual will purge them of thousands of sins Today people are suspicious of a religious person because there is no compatibility between his inner being and external behaviour His fragmented personality is unable to instil goodwill towards religion in the mind of the people. The dividing line between the religious and the irreligious, between a believer and a non-believer has disappeared This shouls urge the religious people to give serious thought to the matter I see only one way of strengthening the power of religion—developing a feeling of unity or equality and creating a bond between religion and morality

4

Religion is first Reflected in Moral Behaviour

'Religion' is an old term. It is ingrained in the psyche of the people No other term is more familiar. I feel it is because of over familiarity that people feel less inclined towards and indentified with religion In olden times we used to mention the term 'religion' with great reverence In the present-day world religion can be acceptable only on the basis of experimentation. When it comes to religion, there are two streams of thought, both being extreme At one end are people who want for ever to keep tied to tradition They do not want any change or modification in the form of religion derived from tradition or heritage They are not in favour of subjecting religion to any surgery. At the opposite end are people who squarely and totally reject religion Both these extreme view-points are incapable of creating a proper balance

If acceptance of the hereditary character of religion is not desirable, its rejection is altogether undesirable. Let me ask you if religion can be completely rejected ? No one who has the slightest intelligence, who things in the language of unity, harmony and love can ever reject religion In the absence of understanding the distinction between institutionalized religion and religion as such, people fall into the error of rejecting religion It is rationality and spirituality which have given rise to society When man was alone, he used to roam around like an animal The first signs of nonviolence arose when he started living in groups. It can be rephrased in the reverse; when the first signs of nonviolence arose, man started living in groups. The first principle of socialness is acceptance of other person's existence and adherence to ethical self-restraint. An instance of such restraint—both individual and social—is people not transgressing into others' houses or robbing others of their head gear Ethical self-restraint prevents people from becoming a hindrance to other people Where did this restraint

originate ? I would say it has its origin in religion, nonviolence and nonpossession. Our sense of discrimination enables us to distinguish between obligation and non-obligation, edible and inedible, nectar and poison, grass and corn. It is made possible by religious awareness.

Religion having divorced itself from its base—spirituality—has come to be shackled by externally imposed rules. And a shackled religion instead of developing religious awareness frustrates it. I am not against rules, nor do I suggest abandoning them. In the words of Acharya Shankar, 'As long as there is invisible life in this body, even Lord Shiva has to obey prescriptions and prohibitions.' But I do not like to be a captive of artificial rules uninformed by spirituality. I want my religion to be the culmination of my independent awareness. It should not be a birth-related imposition. People regard themselves as Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Jains, Buddhists and Sikhs. What causes them to do so is genealogy not religiousness Genealogy can be a source of inspiration to religion; it cannot be its soul The soul of religion is spirituality Only that person is religious who has an agile spiritual awakening, irrespective of his or her genealogy.

Some people wonder what would happen to their religion if a particular system of government was established Such a thinking belongs to a lifeless religion No system of government can pose a challenge to a religion full of spiritual splendour. If I exist, then how is it that religion does not exist ? The question of protecting religion arises only when religion is supposed to have an existence separate from that of the religious person. A system of government which regards religion useless may do only temporary harm to it. It cannot permanently harm it It has been seen that the very system which destroys traditions in the beginning establishes them again in the middle of its regime and espouses them in the end. We care more for tradition than for religion. The survival of religion automatically ensures the survival of tradition. But if only tradition without religion survives, what good will it do ? I am never worried about the fall because it is invariably followed by spring. All I am worried about is the safety of the roots of the tree.

Bliss and spiritual alertness are the soul of religion. They consitute the most attractive face of religion. We are seldom aware of them because we use introversion very little Religion should never have an external origin, nor should it be an imposition Its springs should be within, even as a well is sustained by its internal springs. The well-digger should only connect the external world with the inner springs. Traditions or sects should also confine themselves to connecting the

inner springs of religion with people's gross external personality. He who is not aware of his inner riches remains deprived of prosperity. He who has no self-confidence becomes lack-lustre and weak. Mental conflicts result from the acceptance of the external and the rejection of the internal. An age characterized by such people and things will be known as an age of insanity.

The old are worried by the religious indifference of the young. But their worry lacks resolution. Are they prepared to bring about a form of religion that may attract the young ?

A stranger and unfamiliar person comes to a village as a new doctor. Successful treatment of one or two cases makes him the centre of attraction of the entire village. The attraction is related to the public benefit. We, the religious people, should deliberate whether our religion too is related to benefit or not. The benefit related to religion is altogether indirect and accrues only after death. The great Jainacharya Umasvati said, 'Liberation is possible only during the present life.' If liberation is possible during one's life-time, why can't heaven be also present here ? Shall we consider that person religious who has no experience of heaven or of liberation ?

No attraction is possible towards extreme indirectness. May be, people might have felt attracted towards the idea of reaching heaven after death at some time in the past. Such attraction cannot be felt by the modern thoughtful man. He wants to see religion's effect on life in the present. Our religious tradition is paying very little attention to the present. That is why it does not appear attractive. I am not endorsing the idea of not worrying about the distant future. What I want to emphasize is that we should not give up worrying about the present.

Today people are feeling the necessity to reestablish religion. That form of religion can benefit both the present and the future whose basis is spirituality and whose end-result is morality.

Morality is a relative term. If socially approved mores are deemed morality, their form can never be unchanging. Time and clime change and with them change the moral beliefs of society. Very few practices have escaped approbation and disapprobation of society at one time or another. Morality as end-result of religion is assessed not by social beliefs but by personal purity. There is no place for exploitation, oppression, crookedness, arrogance and frenzy in the behaviour of a religious person. It is full of propriety, truthfulness and simplicity, and it is such behaviour that constitutes morality. Shall we call that an incense-stick which even when burnt does not make the air fragrant ?

Shall we call him religious who does not reflect the spirit of religion in his behaviour ? Just as whenever there is smoke there must be fire, wherever there is morality there must be religion. Seeing smoke we infer the (invisible) presence of fire. Likewise, encountering moral behaviour we can infer the religious spirit inherent in a man.

If I think aright, I should say religion is first reflected in morality and only later in worship. Violation of the above order indicates absence of [illegible]. Will a mansion without a strong foundation endure ? Can a structure built on worship without [illegible] proper protection ? I will like to answer these questions thus : In the absence of morality, the place of worship will tumble and religion will not be safe on this earth.

5

Religion Separated from Spirituality Denotes Unrighteousness

A parrot is inside a cage It is muttering something It is repeating what it was made to learn by rote A parrot has memory but no thinking Man has both memory and thinking He does not repeat what he has crammed. He thinks afresh, seeks new paths and treads them

The buffalo was a beast of burden thousands of years ago and is so even now. Nothing has changed in its life during the long years It has made no progress because it is incapable of independent thinking

Man on the other hand has made tremendous progress He began with the stone age and has arrived in the nuclear age Starting from a hovel he has acquired a multi-storey mansion. He has registered progress in every field of life The binding force between memory and independent thinking is tradition In the absence of tradition man would not have been different from a buffalo. The history of human development is the history of traditions The light generated by past experiences has made it possible for man to discover many new tracks

Some people want to discontinue tradition, but it is not possible. One endowed with memory can never rid himself of tradition, for the two are intimately related. If I were not to mince words, I would say that memory itself is tradition

We are human beings; memory is our privilege. Since we want to benefit from the past, we cannot free ourselves from tradition, we can, however, rectify it. This is where the usefulness of training comes in Even birds and animals are trained and they become skilled too but they cannot become as skilled as man, since they lack independent thinking.

Once a monkey was trained. He was in attendance on a monarch. One day the king was asleep and the monkey was on guard with a naked

sword in his hand. Just then a fly sat down on the king's throat. This made the moneky angry and he struck it with the sword. The king began to bleed profusely. The monkey had training but no power of reflection. He did not have the ability to refer things to a context. Man has this ability.

Man cannot progress if he does not combine reflection and contemplation with training. All development in recorded history has been the outcome of combination of memory, tradition, training, reflection, and contemplation. We want to talk of religion also because it shares the above trait. Neglect of religion results not only in the denial of development but also in the severance of relation with the basis of group or social life. The very existence of social life depends on truth and trustworthy behaviour. It is mutual trust that has brought men together And it is on the same basis that life's commerce goes on. If the tendency to behead a person lying in one's lap had been widespread, man would have been isolated and barbaric, without the right to lead a social life. But that is not the case Man has faith in truth. And truth begets trust. It is on account of this trust that people are playing different roles in society. If social development is not possible without giving central importance to truth, can it be possible to survive by neglecting religion ? I am absolutely sure that it is not possible. What is religion but the same truth ?

A Sanskrit poet has said, 'A person devoid of religion breathes like the bellows of a blacksmith, but does not live in the true sense of the word.' I would have put it differently by maintaining that such a person cannot even breathe. Can someone breathe in the lap of a hungry wolf ? Is it possible for a man to lead a social life by giving birth to violence, cruelty, falsehood and stealing ? If it is impossible, it means that it is impossible to live without religion With the coming of autumn the tree sheds everything—leaves, blossoms and fruit. It is once again laden with all of them with the coming of spring. This cycle is perennial. When both power and money become part of religion, a revolution of ideas comes into being and religion becomes cribbed and confined. It results in the need to discipline religion and once again it becomes pervasive. Even during autumn the existence of the tree remains secure Likewise, even when religious people disappear, the existence of religion is not endangered. It is like a building duly constructed but crumbling down with the ravages of time. With the building erect, space is manifest; with its crumbling down, space becomes imperceptible. However, in either case the existence of space is not in doubt. When

religious people are good, religion is manifest; when they get entangled in external rituals, religion becomes imperceptible. But non-manifestation is not the same as non-existence.

With the increase in materialism people are progressively ignoring religion. According to Marx religion is opium, an intoxicating drug. It makes people frenzied. Those believing in Marxism consider religion the biggest obstacle to development. Communist countries have even tried to extirpate religion. But all such things relate to the external form of religion; for the form can be forgotten, religion itself cannot be forgotten. Deep reverence does make one somewhat intoxicated towards him he reveres. Do nationalists not feel a bit heady when it comes to the glorification of their country? Are lovers of language free from some kind of intoxication felt in the use of good language? All means adopted and revered by human beings, like caste, colour, or class become sources of intoxication. Why should we then deny the truth that religion is intoxicating? In this context it is also necessary to highlight another truth. This intoxication is in the body of religion, not in its spirit. The body of religion is sect and the spirit of religion is spirituality. It is very easy to acquire a body; the spirit is acquired through dedicated practice. There are very few religious people who go as far as to acquire the spirit of religion. Most religious people merely worship the body of religion. How can they save themselves from sectarian intoxication? When people cling to the body of religion and keep away from spirituality, religion becomes lifeless. As a result, self-discipline and comprehensive vision or catholic attitude are destroyed. Religion is reduced to being a mere bundle of artificial rules and narrow viewpoints. Such a religion hinders social transformation. It is under these circumstances that social revolutionaries, thinking that it is an institution that gives refuge to conservative practices, try to eliminate it. We have no respect for such a body of religion which is conservative and divorced from spirituality. We need a great revolution in the field of religion. Acharya Shree Tulsi (now Ganadhipati Gurudev Tulsi) has provided a proper leadership in this direction, and through the medium of Anuvrat the seeds of a revolution are being sown.

Those practising religion throughout life fail to develop a comprehensive vision and friendliness. The result is that a religion shorn of spiritual dignity finds itself incapable of bringing about a transcendental transformation of life. Our physical sciences are quite

adequate to bring about physical transformation. For that we do not have to take refuge in religion. Those given to telling their beads daily think the day wasted when they fail to do so; they do not have this feeling of wasted time when they indulge in dishonest and immoral behaviour. Their understanding of religion is not aimed at transforming life but at perpetuating the imperfections of life. Religion is used not for removing the evils of behaviour but for seeking condonation of the ill-effects of those evils. A man was once telling a qualified physician that he was helpless in giving up his extreme weakness of the palate. He wanted the physician to give him a medicine that would enable him to eat excessively without falling ill. Do religious people also not think in the same language ? Two persons are fighting a legal battle in a court. Both pray for victory before going to the court. Does the one who is blameworthy not thus want victory of falsehood over truth, of irreligion on religion ? If he does, how can it be said that he has faith in truth or religion ? He regards religion merely as a means of achieving his selfish ends.

Whenever religion becomes a means of satisfying wishes, it gets defiled. And defiled religion is a terrible thing. Lord Mahavira had given a clear warning against such a religion : 'Defiled or perverted religion is as dangerous as are drinking deadly poison, wrongly handled weapons and evil spirits cultivated without the knowledge of defensive measures.' It was this kind of religion which Marx called opium. Religion reinforced with spirituality is never intoxicating and can never be called opium.

What is spirituality ?

The experience of freedom . It frees one from the afflictions and bonds of desires.

The experience of completeness It removes vacuity.

The experience of blessedness : It puts an end to the tradition of sorrow.

The senses, the mind, and the intellect are phenomenal objects. They are not self-illumined. What really illumines them is spirituality, though from behind the curtains, as it were. it is from there that the demand for freedom emanates the voice of completeness arises from there. Blessedness billows out of it only. A bulb starts emitting light as soon as it is switched on. But the bulb is not the source of that light. The source is the electric power house. Likewise, the source of consciousness is not the senses or the mind or the intellect, but spirituality which is surging like an endless ocean within every

individual.

That moment is not interconnected with the source of religion which lacks the experience of freedom. That moment also is not interconnected with the source of religion which lacks the experience of completeness. So too is that moment not interconnected with the source of religion which lacks the experience of blessedness. How can one expect there to be light where there is no interconnection with the source of light ?

6

Sorrow : Assurance of Liberation

Human nature seeks but one goal . deliverance from suffering or, in formal language, attainment of happiness Every religious book assures deliverance from sorrow People cannot be attracted by a method that does not give such an assurance But one might ask the question whether the assurance is being fulfilled or not ? If it is being fulfilled, the light of religion cannot be extinguished even by the fiercest storm. But if it is not being fulfilled, it is worth investigating whether the fault lies in (a) the remedy, (b) the physician, (c) the method of using the remedy, or (d) the patient himself

- (a) If the fault lies in the remedy, another remedy will have to be tried
- (b) If the fault lies in the physician, another physician will have to be approached
- (c) If the fault lies in the method, it will have to be changed
- (d) If the fault lies in the patient himself, his nature will have to be refined

Let us take up these possibilities one by one.

(a) There does not seem to be any deficiency in the spiritual form of religion Being one-sided its aspect as a cult or form of worship has totally disintegrated. Chanting the name of God may help attaining concentration. So also listening to the scriptures and other forms of worship. But can a mind not intimately interrelated with the experience of unity (nonviolence) ever attain concentration ? Can it attain concentration without having truth enshrined in it ? Can a man not opposed to robbing others of their existence have concentration ? Can a mind not full of innate happiness (brahmcharya) achieve concentration ? Can a mind not free from the affliction of desires attain concentration ? Only that mind can concentrate which is endowed with the ability to perform a meritorious act of devotion, such as a vow or penance The present disability of religion lies in its instrumental aspect

becoming stronger than the material or substantive aspect. It can be remedied by giving the first place to the substantive aspect and only the second place to the instrumental aspect of religion.

(b) Most religious preceptors are not as much dedicated to religion as they are to a particular sect. That is why the exposition of religion is more a reinforcement of tradition than an investigation of truth. A man of the world can accept his incompleteness, but it is difficult for a religious guru to do so. A [illegible] can change his [illegible] in the light of new revelation of facts, but a religious guru hesitates to do so. The difficulty of the religious exponent is that he is overinfluenced by indirect realization. What is expected is that he serves only such fare to his followers as has been baked in the fire of self-realization.

(c) Pillars erected too close to each other do not permit the expansion of the building. At the same time they should not be so far apart that it becomes impossible to thatch them. It is natural that there be some distance between thought and practice. In its absence, there would be no scope for dedicated practice. Religion is a process whereby the distance between thought and practice is reduced. Religious thoughts have their spring in the inner being. It cleanses the outer world and goes back to the inner one. The inner world is one of nonacceptance, the outer world is one of acceptance. Bridging the gulf between thoughts and deeds means going from acceptance to nonacceptance or from synthetic approach to analytical approach. The first step of this procedure is the desire to seek release from suffering, the second step is nonattachment to material goods and their consumption; and the third step is restraint in relation to material goods and their consumption. In the world of religion also there is the desire to seek release from suffering, but there is no corresponding practice of non-attachment and restraint, which alone enables us to attain the release. That is why religion is not proving fruitful. It is not reducing suffering. The main causes of suffering are attachment and lack of restraint. No results can accrue without removing the cause(s). Therefore, the centrality of practising non-attachment and restraint in religious conduct is obligatory.

(d) Religion has acquired a hereditary character. Consequently, a religious person does not adopt religion through independent prudence or discrimination but through hereditary means. In older times the son of a *Vaishya* and the son of a *Kshatriya* followed the occupation of their respective fathers. Similarly, a religious person practises the religion of his father. Now the tradition of hereditary occupation has changed. The

son of a businessman becomes a doctor or an engineer or can choose any other profession. There is yet no such choice in the field of religion, or people are not exercising the choice. I am not propounding the thesis that only that person is religious who adopts a religion other than that of his forefathers. But I do like to propound the thesis that a religious person should adopt his hereditary religion only after testing it in the light of his discrimination and experience.

Religious revolution requires cleansing religion of the dross and bringing about pre-requisite and context-bound changes in religion itself, in its exponents, in its practitioners. Only after such a revolution can religion fulfil its promise of relieving suffering.

7

The Touchstone of Religion

Three words are swimming into my ken today—observing (*Preksha*) testing (*Pariksha*) and experimenting (*Prayog*) The first is related to philosophy, the second to logic and the third to science *Preksha* is the philosophy of experiencing the self. One whose inner consciousness has been awakened can see the subtle, the real and the remote scenes. In today's language, philosophy is a kind of intellectual exercise. But in reality it is not so Knowledge derived through the observance of invariable concomitance or logical rules cannot be termed as philosophy In philosophy there is a direct contact between the seer and the seen. No instrumentality is involved. Why is it so ? It is only when its interpretation is attempted that we find ourselves in the realm of logic In the world of philosophy there is knowledge as well as experience but no use of language. Language is a medium and it is used only in the world of indirect experience. The scope of logic is mediated knowledge or knowledge derived through indirect experience Logic and science can be taught, but philosophy cannot be taught It is accessible only as a result of one's purity of bare awareness In this context, I should perhaps say only this much that both the knowledge and interpretation of *Preksha* can be had only by dedicated practice How very relevant is the following saying here ! 'गुरोस्तु मौनं व्याख्यानं शिष्यास्तु छिन्नसंशया. ।'

Philosophy becomes explicit only when both the guru's expositon and the disciple's adoration is speechless It was this very experience which Lord Mahavira spoke about 'He who sees/observes has no use for words ' The same thing I will like to put differently, 'Words are meant only for those who have no direct contact with truth ' Today we want to know truth through the medium of words, the reason being that we lack *Preksha* At present, we have only two areas . testing and experimenting But it is not impossible for us to operate in the area of *Preksha* It looks impossible because we lack the prerequisites,

dedicated practice and energetic effort. Once we successfully undertake meditation, the doors of *Preksha* get automatically opened.

Testing is a logical procedure. Its main basis is the individual. Co-occurrence of smoke and fire was first observed by one individual and then by countless others. It became a universal observation, true of all people, places and times Therefore, the principle was laid down that where there is smoke there is fire too. This is called generalization. On its basis we came to know the imperceptible target through perceptible means. The perceptible smoke enables us to know the imperceptible fire.

Experimentation is a scientific procedure In it testing is also used, but testing is not its sole constituent It also analyses the process of change and its causes through experiments

At present the two processes of testing and experimenting are not in use in the field of religion Religious conduct is often based on certain assumptions. I am not suggesting that assumptions have no use at all They have a place both in logic and science. Within the realm of logic in the absence of an assumption it is impossible to start the round of assertion and refutation Similarly, in the realm of science, no experimentation is possible without a starting assumption However, a logician cannot cling to the assumption for ever Once the means have enabled him to attain the end, he abondons the world of alternatives and enters the realm of verified truth.

Similarly, once something has been experimentally proved, the scientist abandons the assumption he began with Crutches are not a constituent of the human body. They are tools only. People use them only when they cannot use their legs Is it necessary to use them even after the strength of the legs has been restored ? We cannot give assumptions greater importance than what is given to the crutches We have accepted religion as an assumption and it cannot be termed unwise either, but to continue to accept it for ever as an assumption is nothing short of unwisdom Religion holds no attraction to intellectuals precisely because it has not been validated by the touchstone of logic. It holds no attraction to scientists because it has not been experimentally verified. Religion has become a plaything in the hands of people who are nonintellectual and unscientific. That is why the younger generation treats religion as something antique Really religion has become antiquated in the sense in which an old man, a worn out piece of cloth and a palace in ruins becomes antiquated. But is it not surprising that religion, which is said to be perennial, is being treated as antiquated. It

is only to things ephemeral that the attributes 'new' and 'old' apply That which is perennial can be neither new nor old But is religion perennial ? It is its inner form—spirituality—which is perennial. Its external or outer form is not perennial. Religious dictates, rites and ceremonies are not perennial Since that which is non-perennial is not being revitalized by the perennial, it is becoming antiquated

Religion revitalized by spirituality developed the power to sustain and protect Today even a religious person does not believe that religion can protect him On the other hand, he is seeking how to protect religion Once a person came to meet Acharya (now Ganadhipati Gurudeva) Tulsi and said, 'I want to bury the Gita underground' Acharyashree asked, 'Why ?' He said, 'It is an age of nuclear bombs If kept underground it will remain safe despite atom bombs ' Acharyashree said, 'But who will read it if the human race is exterminated ?' In fact, it is a serious question Some people are worried about the fate of religion fearing a communist takeover, others are worried fearing people's loss of faith in religion in the light of newer and newer revelations by science Religion appears to be helpless in the background of such worries But if religion is indeed so weak and feeble, we hardly need have it It has not right to survive as a global influence if it does not have the inner strength to save itself

Why did religion become so vulnerable and antiquated ? Three points emerge in answering the above question

1. Determining the existence of religion through the authority of the scriptures
2. Establishing religion solely on the basis of the hereafter
3. Supporting the one-sided view of fatalism

Why is it that nonviolence as well as nonpossession is the greatest religion An easy answer is 'This is what the *Uttaradhyayan Sutra* says, what the Gita says and what the Dhammapada says' Because these scriptures say so, nonviolence and nonpossession are a great religion Does every religious person have the experience of their greatness as religion ? If he has, he can establish the greatness of nonviolence and nonpossession without citing the authority of the scriptures If he lacks the personal experience, he cannot derive any benefit from them despite his citing the authority Acharya Siddhasen has said, 'Truth not accessible through the assignment of cause should be endorsed by scriptures, but truth accessible through the assignment of cause should be endorsed by that cause One who does so is the proper interpreter of truth One who does the reverse is not a proper interpreter'

The above proposition was put forward by Acharya Siddhasen on logical grounds. I would like to restate it in experiential terms thus : Subtle truths should be endorsed by scriptures and truth that can be practised in everyday life should be endorsed by experience One who does so interprets truth properly. He who interprets experiential truth on the authority of the scriptures, hides the perceptible under the cover of imperceptible. Religion does not concern itself with this world the way it does with the other world. A religious person does not see the relevance of religion as much now and here as he does in the hereafter. He values the future higher than the present. He is proving the dictum, 'दीर्घं पश्यत मा ह्रस्वं', (seeing the distant is better than the near.)

It is not improper to seek solution to the problems in the other-world context of religion. But it betrays a onesided approach to seek the solution in the above context by ignoring the context of the present-day problems.

The principle upholding the accountability of one's action (कर्मवाद) is quite scientific Every action has a reaction. It cannot be gainsaid. But the above principle of *Karmavad* should be the fountain-spring (प्रेरणा-स्रोत) of determined effort. But it is not so. One of the causes of the present-day India's poverty and misery is the fatalistic outlook. The lamp of determined effort has been extinguished by the typhoon of fatalism. Even our religious atmosphere has lost all its glory by the one-sided support given to fatalism. Since we want a religious revolution, we would like to see the perennial form of religion to gain ascendancy. It cannot be brought about without changing the outlook of the religious people. In the present scientific age it is expected of a religious person that

(a) he should try to understand religion more in the context of experimentation and less in that of scriptures.

(b) he should give up the desire to gain happiness in the other world and try to cleanse and refine the present life.

(c) while accepting fatalism he should not allow it to eclipse determined effort.

(d) he should substitute faith in religion by testing and experimenting in the field of religion.

Let it be remembered that rubbing gold on touchstone does not diminish its value, and the burning of incense-sticks will result in permeating the atmosphere with fragrance

8

A Sketch of Religion

We need a kind of power which besides being self-illuminated is capable of illumining others too

We need a kind of power which while itself remaining non-accumulative is capable of restraining the disposition of accumulation.

We need a kind of power which while itself remaining nonviolent is capable of controlling violence.

The power we need is spirituality.

We need religion until religion and we are two separate entities. We need it until we are not in harmony with our existence After achieving that harmony, religion is no longer needed

What use is a boat once we have crossed the river ? Means have limited uses, they are not useful in all places and at all times.

Religion is needed so long as the mystery of the unknown persists. Despite great strides made by science, there is much that remains unknown. Let us recall what Newton said, 'Whatever the world may think about me, in reality I am like a child who is gathering shells on the sea shore.'

First comes knowledge, then comes faith The latter is a condensed and profound form of the former. The condensed form of water is ice and that of milk is curds. Those who do not know what religion is profess faith in it. How is it possible ? Can there be ice without water or curds without milk ?

Why should we believe in religion if religion too makes available the same things as do physical means ?

Religion will exist as long as I last. When I become separated from my true existence, religion gets destroyed, not by any communist but by me myself

Society suffers from two problems: physical distress and spiritual indifference Physical distress can be removed by increased production

of goods, but spiritual indifference can be cured only by religion.

Whatever its popularity in the past, religion is no longer popular now. The iron has got rusted; it no longer has a cutting edge. The building is in ruins; it can no longer provide protection.

People are not deriving from religion what it is meant to deliver. One takes medicine to effect a cure. What would one think of a person who goes on taking medicine even though it shows no positive results ?

Let us get saturated with such knowledge as would automatically generate righteousness.

Anuvrat is undoubtedly a religion but it is context-free and unqualified It is a religion on the basis of the observance of vows (*Vrat*) as its very being. *Vrat* means a screen or a cover. Houses began being built when the need arose to provide men a cover from cold, heat, sun and storm. *Vrat* began being investigated into when men felt the need to provide themselves a cover from pain and disquiet.

Can the skin of a fruit quench the thirst after its juice has dried up or can the scaffolding create shed after the canopy has been blown away ?

Consciousness is pure, bright and clear. It needs no cleansing. If the filth mixed with it is removed, water regains its intrinsic purity. If the external moral filth mixed with it is removed, consciousness regains its intrinsic purity.

A *Vrati* (one who observes *Vrat* or vows) cannot be created. People become *Vrati* by themselves. The skin is the *Vrat* of our body. What would have happened to our nerves, sinews and ligaments in the absence of skin. The peel is the *Vrat* of the mango. What would have happened to mango juice if the peel had not been there ? Who asked the skin to protect the nerves, sinews and ligaments ? Who asked the peel to protect the juice ? Every thing in nature comes into being carrying its own *Vrat*. One wonders why is it that human psyche alone is born without carrying its *Vrat*.

Once a man wanted to know if Anuvrat can succeed in these immoral times. I told him that the success of the lamp is manifest only in the last night of the dark half of the month, not in sunlight. No matter how deep or intense the darkness, it vanishes the moment the lamp is lighted.

Acharya (now Ganadhipati Gurudev) Tulsi owns nothing, but those given to accumulative propensity come to meet him. Accumulation craves the direction of non-accumulation. It represents the power of spirituality. Conditions have to be created in which

non-accumulation does not seek the road to accumulation and nonviolence does not seek confluence with violence

Remaining stationary and moving ahead are both useful within their own contexts We accept changelessness and tradition also. One class of people wants to destroy changelessness and tradition while another wants to cling to it. Neither is right. We do need the earth to walk on, but shall we like our feet to get stuck to the earth ? We may seek the support of a wall, but shall we like our body to get stuck to it ?

At present religion too like the body and property has assumed the character of patrimony It is not at all desirable

9

Can Religion be Accessible by Faith ?

Once a man walked upto the sea shore carrying a pitcher in his hand. The pitcher is there and the sea is there. Is the sea water accessible to the pitcher ? It will not be right to say that it is not acceessible But it will be not completely true to say that it is accessible. In fact it is accessible as well as inaccessible From the point of view of totality it is not accessible, from a partial or limited point of view it is accessible. A pitcher can also diminish the quantity of the sea water in proportion to its capacity.

It is difficult to say that religion is accessible to the intellect. But it is also not easy to say that it is not accessible to the intellect.

Religion is infinite. To say that it is accessible to the intellect amounts to saying that a pitcher can measure the ocean. Infinite truth can be known only through knowledge. Then why was the question asked as to whether religion is accessible to the intellect ?

Intellect represents the limits of our knowledge Living being as such have merely a trace of knowledge Those having only one sense are capable of experiencing pleasure and pain There is an ascending order of knowledge from beings endowed with only one sense upto those endowed with five senses. Among living beings man has the greatest access to knowledge. Many other living beings have the senses as men have. Among them some have mind too. But intellect is not present in most living beings. Man alone has it. He has the power to take decisions. He has intuition too. Through it man comes to see and know even things unseen and unknown, In fact man has had the propensity to make the unknown known. The tradition of investigation is thousands of years old It results in increasing the limits of knowledge and consequently in reducing the quantum of the unknown. Bullocks were beasts of burden in the past; they are so in the present and will continue to be the same in future too, because they lack intellect. Man has the intellectual ability to take decisions. The intellect grows through

work-experience also. Experience makes a man skilled. There are instances of people, not having been formally as engineers, acquiring engineering skills through sheer practical experience and personal effort. Knowledge is not found in equal measure in all persons. It too has gradation. Generally one gains experience with age. But here too, the rate of growth not being the same in all cases, not everyone earns the competence to grasp infinite truth like that of religion. There are individual differences too. One man accepts religion unquestioningly; another says he will do so only after due deliberation. The former belongs to the class of the faithful; the latter to that of the intellectual We find these two classes everywhere these days The intellectual's acceptance of a thing is a consequence of proper evaluation and decision, the faithful's acceptance is the direct outcome of his faith However, according to me no act of faith is totally devoid of intellectual thinking

Once a man asked me, 'who do you regard as your *guru* ?' I replied, 'Me myself' The next question was, 'How is it possible, because you treat Acharya Tulsi as your *guru* ?' I said, 'It is all too true that I regard him as my *guru*. But it was my own decision to have him as my *guru* since I found him worthy to be so ' So even in this respect the decision belongs to me Even when scriptures are held in high esteem, it is a decision of an individual to regard them so That Mahavira, Buddha and Krishan are divine depends only on those who accept them as divine. They did not announce to the world that they were divine. In our acceptance lies the validity of the proposition that they are divine. Validity and invalidity are born of people's intellect As said earlier, even the faithful are not altogether devoid of intellect They too concede only that which their intellect dictates Take the case of a child It accepts everything its mother says no matter what she says

Is it true that faith is blind ? Blindness means ignorance, but belief is always propelled by intellect. When such a powerful propulsion becomes intensely compulsive, it comes to be called *faith*.

It is not possible to have faith without knowledge, even as there can be no ice without water Just as curds is a condensed form of milk, faith is a condensed form of knowledge. Where the intellect is inadequate as a deciding agency, the heart becomes instrumental in acceptance

Dharma or religion is accessible only through intellect not through 'non-intellect'

Viewed grossly religion seems to be related more to faith and

much less to the intellect. But a deep examination reveals that one cannot relate to religion without the intellect. In fact, no faithful is devoid of the intellect and no intellectual is devoid of faith. Knowledge and faith both are our norms. Then how can there be only one question : Is religion accessible to the intellect ? There should be the second question too : Is religion accessible to faith ?

10

Religion and Worship

The biggest problem related to religion concerns its acceptance in an institutionalized form In practical life two aspects emerge while deliberating about religion :

1. Religion as worship.
2. Religion as conduct

There is no uniformity in religion as a mode of worship since there are innumerable modes of worship But there is uniformity in religion as a form of conduct Ordinary people understand worship better than religion They say the path of devotion is both simple and good. From a certain point of view, it may be right too, but it has the highest chances of deception For all his day-long misdeeds and sinful activities a man wants to make amends and seek expiation merely by reciting the line 'प्रभु मोरे अवगुण चित न धरो', (O Lord, please don't heed my mistakes and vices) He makes the unsuccessful effort to wash all his life-long sins by having one dip in the waters of the holy Ganges. In fact worship was aimed only at enabling a worshipper to concentrate on a symbol. But with the passage of time the same path of worship or devotion became the main centre of deception. On the other hand, there is not scope for deception in the path of righteous conduct, because the very basis of conduct is spiritual purity.

In worship the purity of conduct takes a back seat In itself worship is not deception, but it has been turned into deception. In a special sense bathing in the Ganga, visiting temples, meeting saints, rendering service and similar modes of worship were all right, but with the passage of time people came to think that they could indulge in sinful activities with impunity, for they would expiate all their sins through worship. So interpreted, worship progressively becomes alienated from the quintessence of religion

The conduct of man as an independent agent arose as part of ethics It was high character not worship which came to be associated with

Anuvrat. It is absolutely linked with the moral tradition. During the Middle Ages exalted character was not given as much importance as worship. People came to like worship but the history of the past fifteen centuries bears witness to the fact that it has resulted in a fall in character. The obscenity carved on temples from south to north leaves one dumbfounded. One of the factors responsible for it was the influence of the *Tantriks* or *Vammargis* (followers of the religious cult teaching peculiar and mystical formulae or rites for the worship of the deities or for the attainment of superhuman power). But this influence was also made possible due to the lack of encouragement to the importance of cultivating high character.

To use a metaphor, for enjoying shade exalted conduct acts like the tent and worship like the ropes. Regrettably the tent has blown away and only the ropes have been left behind. Worship is not useless, but it has become a mask and character has become out of reach. Worship was originally intended to be instrumental in awakening the spirit of religion and that was, therefore, the purpose of visiting temples and meeting saints but these activities were mistaken for ends in themselves, so that one who undertook them needed nothing else to do. People got lost in worship ignoring religion altogether In fact, there are people whose character is exalted even though they do not believe in worship and they are truly religious Prof Gora considered himself an atheist, but Gandhiji regarded him as a perfect believer because his conduct was pure and spiritual.

Wherever stress is put on worship, religion is ignored On the contrary those who stress good conduct pay much less importance to worship Despite a multiplicity of modes of worship, character or good conduct remains uniform and invariable. According to Acharya Niranjan Suri, harmony between the physical senses, vital breath, mind, air and soul is *Adhyatma-Yoga* (the discipline involved in withdrawal of senses from mundane objects and their concentration on the Supreme Being). We like agreeability in religion too Therefore, music, art, dance etc. were given a place in the religious field and the whole thing was made a compulsory part of worship But agreeability has no place in righteous conduct.

Basically I do not consider worship a hindrance to religion, but a religious person should be defined on the basis of exalted character Character is primary; worship is secondary. One cannot worship at all times. But one cannot neglect righteousness of conduct at any time That is, a man can remain moral, honest and true all his life, but it is only

occasionally that he can worship. It is not possible to call a man righteous if he reverts to righteousness after lapsing into unrighteousness for a few hours. Worship can be likened to medicine, whereas good conduct is staple food. Food is always needed to be eaten, but medicine is taken only occasionally. Worship is a kind of reinforcement, but good conduct is spontaneous and natural. In the absence of the latter the former has no value whatever.

At the back of righteousness lies one's own purity and sensitivity to others. At the back of worship is the prevention of the corroding of righteousness It is true, worship adds decoration to religion, but the fundamental thing is only religion or good conduct It means that we have to remove the deceptive aspect of worship and retain its inspirational aspect But even after doing so, worship should not be associated with *Anuvrat*, else *Anuvrat* too will become a sect A sect comes into being the moment worship gets associated with conduct

Now let us try to understand the question of practical religion or religion in practice Religion can inform our behaviour only if we first succeed in shaking off the hardened genetically conditioned habits of worship. In the absence of a solid base of righeousness, worship cannot help us attain liberation As for behaviour, it is of two kinds ·

1 That which has no direct effect on others

2 That which has direct effect on others.

It is behaviour which is the touchstone of religiosity Authoritativeness belongs to the practice of religion, because it is believed that its violation amounts to self-degradation So long as religious people do not accept the challenge of religious practice, others will not be inspired to act rightly; not will the brighter side of religion reveal itself. Keeping slightly aloof from the path of worship and awakening spirituality in oneself alone will ensure the presence of religion in practice Thereafter, there will be no need for preaching religion.

Indian thinking got blunted in the past few centuries. As a result no new insights have been generated. Worship devoid of right conduct is always dangerous. Now new ideas are being propagated which it is not possible to stop.It is clear that no religion can endure merely on the basis of worship.

11

Religion Defined

The history of religion is very old and will be in the making for a long time to come. In fact religion will last as long as the mysteries of life and death continue. Those trying to destroy religion are tired; on the other hand, religious publicity has been ever on the increase. Russia (former Soviet Union) has been trying to destroy religion for thirty-five years, but now the ruling party has admitted that, despite all their efforts, religion has, far from decreasing, in fact, increased. Religious faith has registered an upward swing in Russia during the past thirty-five years.

Religion is a natural human instinct. It helps man contemplate the unknown. It is the purity of our soul. In other words, to be liberated from passions or from attachment and hatred is religion. All else is delusion. Religion has not been the cause of terror, wars and assassinations. Fighting takes place where there are false values. For example, these days politics is valued more than its worth; hence, it makes people fight among themselves. Likewise, in the past, people attached false values to religion, which resulted in fighting.

Religion and its institutionalization are two different things Religion is amorphous and intangible, but human beings prefer the tangible. They have given tangible shape to knowledge in the form of books, to time in the form of clocks, and to God in the form of idols. The same thing has happened to religion. Man has invested religion also with a form. This is exactly what symbolism is. The nation is intangible but it is symbolized in the national flag. In order to make religion tangible, it has been turned into an institution. It is mentioned in one of the *Upanishads* that 'God felt lonely and, therefore, dualism was created, and by expanding the soul the world was created on the basis of name and form. The same attraction for name and form makes the intangible tangible.'

Jain, Bauddha, Muslim, Christian, Hindu are all names and their corresponding institutions are forms of religion. Religion in itself is

intangible but we perceive it through its name and form and it is for this reason that every religion has a distinct name and form. All fighting has taken place because of the name and the form. No wars took place because of religion. In Jain religion fifteen types of liberated souls have been recognized out of whom actual description has been given of three types : *Sva-ling-siddha, Anya-ling-siddha* and *Grih-ling-siddha.* Those liberated in the guise of a Jain are *Sva-ling-siddha*, those liberated in any other guise are *Anya-ling-siddha* and those liberated in the guise of householder are *Grih-ling-siddha.* It makes it clear that religion is no monopoly of any particular sect, because it is possible to get liberated even in the guise of a householder, besides in that of a sect

Because religion is our soul's purity, there is no difference of opinion regarding spiritual purity Difference arise when it comes to religious rituals In Jain philosophy's *Naigamanaya* one comes across the following catechism : 'Where do you live ?' 'In Jambu Island ' 'Where in Jambu island do you live ?' 'In *Bharatvarsh* ' 'Where in *Bharatvarsh* do you live ?' 'In such and such state ' 'Where in state do you live ?' 'In such and such town.' 'Where in that town do you live ?' 'In such and such locality.' 'Where in that locality do you live ?' 'In the house bearing such and such number ' 'Where in that house do you live ?' 'In such and such room.' 'Do you live all over that room ?' Ultimately, the conclusion reached and the answer given is 'within oneself' In truth, to live within one's inner being is religion; to move out of it is irreligion Lord Mahavira has given four alternatives :

1. Someone gives up religion not the institution
2. Someone gives up the institution not religion.
3. Someone gives up both religion and the institution
4. Someone keeps both religion and the institution

12

Religion : Scientific or Unscientific

'Can religion provide answers to the present problems ?' The above question haunts the minds of the intellectuals. It is also discussed in various seminars. But who would answer it ? The propounders of religion whose religion is being practised are no longer alive. What is available is what they said and the scriptures recording it with all their limitations. There is one utterance but it has many meanings. There is one scripture but its commentaries are many. Consequently religions too are many.

Truth is one, it cannot vary from person to person. My truth and your truth cannot be different Then how can my religion and your religion be different ? If religion is Truth, it should not admit of individual variations. And if it is not Truth, it should not be given much importance.

Religion and Truth have been defined in countless ways, yet they look like being yet undefined What is Truth ? That which exists is alone true. What is religion ? To be alert about the existence of awareness alone is religion. Truth puts on different forms when it is interpreted in different contexts. Since there are different forms of religion the question is asked, 'Is religion scientific ?' The question has become all the more pressing because we are living in a scientific age. Science emphasized experimentally proved facts. Scientific investigtion yields results whose validity transcends time and space. A replicated experiment yields the same results everywhere and at all times. Is religion scientific in this sense ? Can it be subjected to experimental verification ? Do we get universal results by testing it—results transcending time and space ? Many such questions are asked to determine the scientific character of religion

Religion means existence. The nature of a thing is religion. He who defined religion, thus, experienced the inner reality of religion. The nature of the soul is consciousness. Experiencing consciousness is itself

religion. Experience is always personal. Thoughts can be collective, but experience cannot be collective. A thought can be tested; an experience cannot be tested. Thoughts manifest themselves in language; there is no way to make experience manifest. Under these conditions experience cannot be verified. That which cannot be verified; that which cannot be tested in a laboratory, cannot be scientific. In this sense religion is not scientific Those who have experienced the soul or consciousness; those who are awake to their soul's existence have had uniform results. They cannot vary according to time and space. From the point of view of the uniformity of results, religion is scientific.

We talk of the scientific or unscientific character of religion without experiencing it. This is the biggest cause of our inability to understand religion On the plane of ideas both arguments and counter-arguments are given. They have no place in relation to experiential truth There are some who prove the existence of religion through reason; there are others who use arguments to disprove its existence Some regard themselves theists, others atheists. I see no difference between a bigoted believer and a bigoted non-believer. Each is bent upon refuting the other Neither has any curiosity to know truth Neither is engaged in its quest They live simply on assumptions Both feel self-assured by quoting their respective scriptures I see no difference between believers and non-believers provided both are engaged in the quest for, and are curious to know, Truth One is refuting non-existence by accepting existence, another is rejecting existence by accepting non-existence as having critical importance. But the door of the quest of existence and non-existence is not closed. Therefore, such a non-believer keeps the lamp of belief burning within himself.

We are nursing religious bigotry. When ideas get aligned with religion, bigotry becomes inevitable. Some poeple believe that religion cannot survive without incorporating bigotry We have mistaken religion for an organized association of people, we have given it the form of a caste. Any thing which takes the shape of an organization or caste can never be answerable to truth. The omnipresence of religion and Truth can be proved only on the plane of experience. The growth of sects has not taken place on the basis of the experience of religion and the soul It has taken place on the basis of thinking. Experience unites people, it does not build organizations. Thinking has the potentiality for both uniting and disuniting. It unites people and builds organisations on the basis of common thinking. But where there is organization, there is also that which religion does not favour. There

have been many conflicts for religion, History has criticized religion precisely because a lot of blood has been shed in its name. We still nurse the delusion that bloodshed which took place in the name of sects or organizations was in the name of religion. Interpretations of religion vary considerably. Its code of conduct is also uniform. But all religions have one thing in common . each one said, 'Look inwards, see yourself.' The basic form of religion is none other than this. All religions are agreed on it. No religion refutes it; all religions strongly approve it. Can any sparks of conflict come out of a religion that declares, 'Look inwards, see yourself' ? Can it ever lead to bloodshed ? Conflicts and bloodshed have been caused by castes, organizations and sects which grew in the name of religion.

Is it dangerous to build sects, organizations or castes on the basis of religion ? Most certainly, it is. But this danger cannot be avoided. Is it possible to light an oil-lamp without creating soot ? These results are incidental to religion It is not possible to prevent them Is there no way of escaping this danger ? There is nothing in this world without a way out If there is an end, there must be a means too The way to avoid this danger is right viewpoint of evaluation We are mistaking a sect's code of conduct for a religious code of conduct. The former has in it seeds of hatred, contempt and conflict. People belonging to another sect are called atheists, satanic, devilish and infidels. This is *the* danger. It cannot happen with the religous code of conduct Its language is quite different It is that of existence. In it there is no room for 'self' and the 'other' And this alone is the way to save oneself from the above danger.

Every sect says, 'Subscribe to me, else there is no salvation for you ' According to Lord Mahavira, anyone who says so binds, does not liberate. Lord Krishna said, 'Come and seek refuge in me, you shall be liberated ' Krishna is Truth. He is soul. He is God One who seeks refuge in Truth is not bound but liberated. Mahavira held that religion transcended sects He said, 'For freedom from suffering joining a sect is not necessary. What is necessary for it is to stay within the self. One who stays within his self needs no initiation into a sect in order to get liberated.' He called such a person *Ashruta-Kevali*. He who stays within the self can be liberated even after having been initiated into a sect Mahavira called such a person *Shruta-Kevali*. In both cases liberation is dependent not on remaining within or without a sect, but on staying within the self. One who is spiritually steadfast gets liberated irrespective of the fact whether he belongs to a sect or does not. One who is not spiritually steadfast cannot be liberated, whether he stays or

does not stay within a sect. Spiritually steadfastness and liberation are coextensive. Sects and liberation are not coextensive. Religion transcends sects; it is the experience of pure consciousness. That is why it brings about the same result in all times and climes. Since its result is universal, it is scientific.

In the age of Mahavira there was religion but there was no *yoga* and philosophy Philosophy, knowledge and conduct—all the three were an integral part of religion *Yoga* and philosophy began to develop as independent disciplines in the third and fourth century B.C. In the fifth and sixth century A.D philosophy and *yoga* become primary and religion became secondary. It got reduced to mere behaviour It took on the characteristics of a bird without wings Both of its wings—philosophy and spiritual practice—got severed. Religion became a bundle of rituals, it became unscientific. This fact began attracting attention in the eighth century A.D Acharya Haribhadra felt that it will not be good to consider philosphy and *yoga* separate from religion He wrote, 'Religion joins together individual and liberation, hence religion itself is *yoga*.' *Yoga* is not anything different. Religion is the nature of things Philosophy analyses the nature of things, therefore it too is not different from religion Realists (those who understand the serious import of the scientific approach) among Jain Acharyas kept saying, 'Philosophy is nothing but perceiving the soul Spiritual knowledge means to know the soul. Good conduct means to remain steadfast in the soul. These three precepts are not different from one another and they together constitute religion.' But the religious people leading a practical life did not let this truth prosper. They kept identifying religion with sects, organizations and castes and presented it merely as a code of conduct. The state and society as institutions both started organizing themselves on the basis of religion. Religion came to occupy their centre stage It received state patronage Religion became state religion. The fate of religion became dependent on the ruler's wishes The religion embraced by the ruler prospered That disapproved by him suffered decline. Similarly, religion approved by strong sections of society began to spread and that of the weaker section continued to lose its vitality. In this dispensation the inner strength of religion (experiencing consciousness, seeing the inner self) kept being pushed to a secondary position Religion began to sustain itself with the support of mystical charms and incantations as well as magical mumbo-jumbo on the one hand and the power of the state and of its stronger sections on the other. It lost its inner vitality Attempts began to be made to keep it alive

through artificial respiration Consequently, its sustenance became dependent on external sources Such a religion can be called neither scientific nor unscientific.

The image of religion in the modern mind is not installed with faith. History soaked in blood associated with it has obscured its purity. The modern thinking individual is not hopeful about the sectarian and organized form of religion—he cannot be, nor should he be so All this notwithstanding, his religious roots have not weakened. The reason is simply that every individual is a lighthouse of consciousness. Knowingly or unknowingly its ways penetrate inside him and religious consciousness gets awakened He experiences the feeling that what he has missed in the world is right within him. That truth of one's own self, spontaneous joy and natural energy is distinctly experienced, which has no parallel in material prosperity. In the present, religion is once again finding an exalted place in the human mind in the form of *Yoga*. It seems that people are seeking in it and finding solutions to present-day problems The scientific character of that cannot be challenged which has the power to resolve and solve.

13

Moral Restraints and Spiritual Observances

Fences are built to protect cultivated fields and embankments are built to protect water reservoirs. Fences are useful when there is a rich harvest and embankments are useful only when water is flooding and billowing. For a field without any cultivation the presence or absence of fences is irrelevant. Likewise, if the dam has no water, how does it matter whether it has embankments or not ? Fences and embankments have no intrinsic usefulness. They acquire usefulness only when there are cultivated fields and waterfilled dams Spiritual observances also have utility only when moral restraints are there There are five moral restraints—nonviolence, truthfulness, nonstealing, all round self-control and nonpossession

Whenever the curtain is rung down on moral restraints and spiritual observances are put on the centre stage, religion loses its lustre Both religion and its followers add lustre to themselves when the first place is given to moral restraints and the second place to spiritual observances

Religion seems to be losing its vigour today because it is losing imperative presence of moral restraints and making spiritual observances imperative An Acharya has put it succinctly thus

'यमानभीक्ष्ण सेवेत, न नित्य नियमान् बुधः।
यमान् पतत्यकुर्वाणो, नियमान् केवलान् भजन्॥'

Practise moral restraints daily and resort to spiritual observances only now and then Both kinds of people stray from the right path—those who do not practise moral restraints daily and those who practise only religious observances. The formula for finding the right equation of this incongruous position of morality is a coordinated and harmonious practice of moral restraints and spiritual observances.

14

The Power of Vows

Vows have been the backbone of Indian culture. No society, which lacks will-power, can be deemed civilized Will-power is developed through vows. That is why vows occupy the central position in Indian life.

All the *Tirthankars* (founders of religious doctrine) and incarnations of the deity have affirmed the importance of vows. There is no religion which has no vows Those who take a vow move within the circle of which the vow is the centre. The bullock bound to an oil-crusher appears to be useless It moves all the time and yet does not inch forward But by its will-power it goes into circular movements and helps crush the seeds to yield oil It cannot be said that it lacks movement even though it moves within a short space. Increasing movement without yielding any results denotes failure But where results accrue, failure does not exist

The desire to work secretly does not exist when self-discipline is made to develop The nation lacks lustre simply because individuals lack confidence in their ability to develop Individual greatness will not reveal itself if no move is made to break through the narrow confines that religion has been reduced to And if individual greatness does not reveal itself. national greatness too will find no expression.

Today man lives between two windows. One of them opens out and another opens inside That which opens out is wide open but that which opens inside is closed Man acts between both of them.

What is coming through the outer window is not desirable What comes from without is penal authority Penal power helps propel state power and social authority. Morality will come into being if the outer window is closed. The inner window gives man the sense of duty, which lies suppresssed in his inner being. One who is a stranger to the inner window is fully familiar with penal power.

Man is not an animal. Animals are driven with the help of penal power. It is a daily sight-sand being brought from rivers on the back of

donkeys and donkeys being thrushed with sticks They are animals. They cannot rebel, nor can they lodge a protest with the government. Man has memory and the power to resist Therefore, he cannot tolerate such injustice He cannot be driven under the threat of punishment. That country is a country of animals where people are driven on pain of punishment. The authority that man has created to rise above that exercised in relation to animals is that of vows.

Once the ruler Dilip was grazing Maharishi Vashisht's cow. Just then a tiger appeared there The ruler came in front of the cow in order to protect it. Seeing him do this, the tiger said ·

'एकातपत्र जगतः प्रभुत्वं, नव वयः कान्तिमिद वपुश्च।
अल्पस्य हेतोर्बहुहातुमिच्छन्, विचारमूढ· प्रतिभासि मे त्वम् ॥'

You wield absolute authority in your kingdom You are gifted with youth and a handsome body Why do you want to sacrifice all these merely in order to save a cow ? Why do you want to pay such a heavy price for a small gain ? I feel you are foolish.

Had there been a selfish person, he would have promptly run away But the ruler did not do so He said to the tiger

'क्षतात् किल त्रायत इत्युदग्र , क्षत्रस्य शब्दो भुवनेषु रूढः।
राज्येन किं तद् विपरीतवृत्तेः, प्राणैरुपक्रोशमलीमसैर्वा ॥'

I am a *Kshatriya* and have been born in a *Kshatriya* family It is the duty of a *Kshatriya* to protect those in distress

The ruler was prepared to sacrifice his life He was not motivated by penal power On the contrary an inner light surfaced and made him aware of his duty. Beyond the awareness of duty lies the awareness of the self In a vow there is no external pressure or helplessness The inner consciousness is awakened and consequently such a man can never do anything undesirable

Some two thousand five hundred years ago Magadh was ruled by King Shrenik. In it lived a butcher named Kalsaukarik. He butchered five hundred buffalows daily He had a som named Sulas. His mentality differed from that of his father When Kalsaukarik died, it was time to pass on the family property to his successor. Before formal succession a buffalow was to be sacrificed Sulas said, 'I shall not agree to it. I can't do it ' Family pressure was brought to bear on him and Sulas agreed The buffalow was right in front of him. The members of the family were ready to perform the ceremony Sulas was given a sword and asked to kill the buffalow. Such a thing cannot be done by a person whose consciousness has been awakened and in whom the power of vows has been aroused Sulas wielded the sword, not against the buffalow but

against his own feet.

People started saying, 'Such a coward does not deserve to be a successor.' He was disqualified to be the successor.

Why did Sulas act the way he did ? Because he had a vow in his mind. No one in whose mind a vow has been born can ever do injustice. In the absence of the vow penal power predominates. Penal power means external control and inner non-restraint A vow is the fruit of a man's liberated conciousness. Transplanting vows in one's life means the birth of religion Without such transplantation a man cannot be deemed religious A vow is the sublime expression of social, national and individual consciousness Awakening the dormant power of consciousness will result in the elevation of the individual, in giving a place of honour to vows in society, and in arousing religiosity. With this the closed window will turn into a lighthouse.

15

The Power of Enclosure

A vow puts a limit on life Development means extension. For unfolding one needs space. Development is possible only within the confines of time and space. Nothing can be interpreted without time and space. Vows and development apparently seem contradictory, but I think they are not really so. The contradiction lies in a man's viewpoint, understanding and imagination. There is no element in this world which is devoid of the quality of co-existence There is no contradiction in the phenomenal world. It is in a man's attitude If our point of view becomes relative, all contradiction will vanish

According to me more devlopment is possible under limitation. One can walk a mile in fifteen to seventeen minutes. With enhanced speed he may take ten to twelve minutes to cover one mile It took Acharya Shree four months to walk from Rajasthan to Ahmedabad You can cover the same distance by plane in two hours. Why so ? Because the aeroplane is an enclosure of speed power. If the plane did not have this enclosure, it could not catch such speed They destroy themselves who want development by breaking the enclosure. A person sitting in a car moves at a speed of fifty miles an hour Can he run at that speed ?

This raises the question, 'Should we accept narrowness ?' Let the question be tackled from a relative point of view. Narrowness is not an exclusive defect Often we dismiss things by dubbing them as narrow. But it is essential to understand the propriety of limits and narrowness

16

Forgiving

One of the Sanskrit poets has said, 'Show me a thing that can compare with milk. Milk is pure and naturally sweet.' Even when heated, transformed and churned, it gives *sneh* (double meaning oiliness and love).

Only he who is great by nature and who is strong can give love. The reason why one is small and weak is tht he is not capable of giving love. (In the Ramayan) Lakshman asked Sugreev for forgiveness of his harsh words .

'मया त्वं परुषाण्युक्तः,
तत् क्षमस्व सखे ! मम।'

Lakshman was not weak. He could pour love where it did not exist. That is why he was capable of seeking forgiveness. The chief of Sindhu Sauvir sought the chief of Ujjayini, Chandpradyot's forgiveness One of them was a captive and another, a captor. One was the vanquished, the other was the victor. Udayan said, 'Lord Pradyot, today is Samvatsari, which is a great occasion of friendship. On this occasion, I forgive you heartily. I beg you to forgive me heartily '

Mahavir believed that friendship is not possible between a great and a small person. Friendship belongs to the realm of equality. If one only forgives but does not seek forgiveness, the former becomes great and the latter small. They cannot be friends. Friendship is possible only between those who both give and seek forgiveness

Pradyot said, 'Can a captive forgive somebody ?' Udayan stepped forward and freeing Pradyot from his shackles made him sit close to him. Both hearts developed ties of love.

The thread of love is at one end unending. It has the capability to create the bond of love among countless hearts.

Will you allow me to regard those 'religions' as true relgions which make people heartless and hostile towards one another, and which demand, for the sake of their extension or survival, that people

of other religions be killed ? A religion shorn of spirituality and wedded to racialism or casteism spreads heartlessness instead of love and stresses division in place of unity. Humanity has suffered long and a good deal as a result of such religions Now it needs only that religion in whose depths there is a perennial spring of love and forgiveness

17

Liberation

One of the Sanskrit poets says that through the world is full of innumerable bonds, none is stronger than the bond of love. A beetle can pierce a hole in wood but remains helpless in the tender embrace of a lotus flower

A lotus flower was unfolding with the rising sun It blossomed fully at noon Just then came a beetle and got captivated by its pollen. It kept revolving around it and finally settled down right in its middle. Evening came, yet the beetle did not leave it The petals of the lotus flower closed and the beetle became a captive Who has not been captivated by love ?

Love for others binds, while love of one's self liberates. Bondage means love directed at others; liberation means love directed at one's own self The latter does not imply narrow selfishness It is natural self-restraint One who loves one's own self can never hold others in bondage Only those people hold others in bondage who are indifferent to their own selves It is for his entertainment that a man imprisons a parrot within a cage Why were zoos created ? Man is not in love with his own self, that is why he entertains himself by holding others captive.

Once a man kicked up a row with one of his neighbours. He developed an angry ' fixation' towards the latter. His eyes became bloodshot with anger whenever he saw the latter It is the bondage of hatred

Another story relates to an old women She began becoming more and more lean and thin. Her son said, 'Mother, are you ill ?' She said, 'No, my son, I have no illness.' 'Then why are you becoming so lean and thin ?' asked the son. She replied, ' Son, curd-churning takes place daily in the neighbour's house and that gives me untold agony. The churning rod does not strikes the curd but my chest. That's what is making me thin.' It is the bondage of jealousy.

Then there was a king. He said, 'Feed the she-goat heartily, but

she should not grow physically.' The villagers puzzled. Rohak found a way out He took the she-goat near the cage of lion and tied it there She was plentifully fed but her body showed no signs of the strength of nourishment. Everytime the lion roared, she lost all the strength she had gained It is a bondage of fear

Once a man went to a wealthy merchant. There a wedding was being celebrated He wanted to take a few things from the merchant. When asked to give them, the merchant pleaded inability and asked him to wait since there was no man there After half an hour he was again asked to give the things and he gave the same reply When asked a third time he again replied that there was no man there Then the visitor said, 'I came to ask you to give me the things thinking that you were indeed a man,' It is a bondage of evaluating criterion.

Not to speak of external bonds, there are so many inner bonds without tackling which tackling the external bonds is as good as impossible

I like liberation, you too like it, everyone likes it. But can we remain liberated without giving up the mentality of keeping others in bondage ? I captivate those smaller than me, it means I open the way for those bigger than me to keep in bondage Not to be under bondage should mean not to keep others in bondage Bondage begets bondage and liberation begets liberation To get liberated from external bonds it is vitally necessary first to get mentally liberated, to get internally liberated

18

Arjava or Sincerity

Gautam said, 'Lord ! what does a man gain by sincerity ?' Lord Mahavira said, 'Gautam ! By sincerity a man gains physical, mental and linguistic straightforwardness, and harmonious tendency, i.e., congruence of speech and action.'

Arjava means sincerity and sincerity is like a lighthouse that can be seen everywhere. Lord Mahavira said, 'Purity is earned by a man who is sincere and straightforward.' An insincere person can never be pure in heart. Children have a sincere heart, that is why everyone loves them. As we grow and gain in wisdom, layers start covering our mind. These layers consist of ignorance, doubt and deception. We do not try to understand others and, therefore, we are not sincere towards them. Further, we incorrectly want to take advantage of others, which too prevents us from being sincere towards them. Had there been no ignorance, doubt and insincerity in this world, people would have loved one another and there would have been no distance between one man and another. It would not have been a divided humanity. A Sanskrit poet says :

'सन्धत्ते सरला सूची, वक्रा छेदाय कर्तरी'

The needle is straight and so joins two (pieces) together and make them one. On the other hand a pair of scissors is crooked and so it severs and cuts one (piece) into two

Sincerity creates bonds of love between hearts while deception or insincerity acts like a pair of scissors and tears hearts asunder.

Those who have written on the science of polity say, 'A man should not be straightforward. You should know that the trees which are straight are cut down and those which are warped and twisted are not cut down.' This politic sentence has served to extinguish the natural light of the human heart. I want to ask you, 'Do you like a man with a crooked body ? Do you believe a person who does not talk in a straightforward way ? Do you like a person who behaves insincerely

with you ? Do you like someone who is crooked at heart ?' All these questions will receive negative answers, which means you do not like them. Then how can it be conceded that we should not be straightforward ? People would not have been afraid of each other if everyone's heart was like an open book Today people are afraid of one another because they harbour in their hearts secrecy, circumlocution, lack of clarity and darkness

Let us not be such simpletons as not to register the reality around us. But let us also not be so dishonest and fraudulent that we pass on the moral filth of our hearts to others. Let us be sincere—alert to the environment around us, and yet free from malice A person who is sincere cannot be deceived Only that person is deceived whose heart is impure

Once an old woman was going somewhere She had a bundle on her head A young man was travelling in the same direction. His compassion was roused He said to the woman, 'Grandma ! Let me carry the bundle for some time. That would give you some relief ' The old woman was convinced of his sincerity and handed over the bundle to him After some time she took it back The young man's heart changed He thought, 'I had the bundle with me earlier. What could this old woman have done if I had run away with it ?' He once again asked the old woman to let him carry the bundle She refused to part with it When he insisted on her giving it to him, she said, 'Now I will not give it to you ' He said, 'Grandma ! Why do you refuse to give it now ?' She replied, 'Son ! I will not part with it now The voice you heard I heard too '

Sincerity is that light of the mind in which nothing remains unclear Insincerity is that darkness of the mind in which a man strays away from the right path and strays away for ever

19

Tender-heartedness

The attraction and fragrance that a rose has, no other flower has. The existence of exaltation (height) and debasement (depth) is a law of Nature. With a mountain there is a peak as well as a foothill. Since a mountain cannot think, there is no conflict between its peak and foothill. Man is a thinking being. One who is on the foothill is filled with a sense of inferiority seeing another on the peak And one who is on the peak is filled with a sense of egotism seeing another on the foothill. For a long time the conflict betwen inferiority and superiority has been going on in men's minds Racial riots take place even in a civilized country like America The whites look down upon the blacks. It has resulted in racial hatred

Even in a country like Inida the two classes of touchables and untouchables continue to this day. No one knows how many people cursed by untouchability have undergone and are still undergoing conversion No class which got on the top rested content until it had declared others inferior It is arrogance Arrogance is the gateway to irreligion Having entered it, men have always illtreated others.

Lord Mahavira was once asked, 'Lord ! How many doors to religion are there ?'

The Lord said, 'There are four doors to religion '

'Pray Lord ! Which ones are they ?' he was further asked.

The Lord replied, 'Peace (शांति), Liberation (मुक्ति), Straightness (ऋजुता), and Tenderness (मृदुता).' Tender-heartedness (मृदुता) is one of the doors which gives entry into the mansion of religion. The door comes first and then comes the mansion. No one can enter a mansion without first entering the door Can anyone be religious without being tender-hearted ? To say that a man is religious but not tender-hearted is like saying that it is day-time but without light. When you do not recognize a period of time, 'day', without light, how will you recognize

something as religion without tender-heartedness (मृदुता) ?

The world of religion has undoubtedly recognized the importance of tender-heartedness but they give it a very narrow meaning. Tender-heartedness (मृदुता) is being understood to mean meekness or humility. Such an understanding though not defective is incomplete. The full meaning of tender-heartedness (मृदुता) is abandonment of cruelty. A man who shows humility without a trace of tender-heartedness cannot be regarded as tender-hearted Only that man can be called tender-hearted (मृदु) in whose heart flows a perpetual stream of compassion. Such a man can never practise exploitation, cannot ignore the happiness and comforts of others in order to keep himself happy and comfortable, and cannot do anything likely to harm others

Even a lion looks back as he moves forward. Is it not necessary for a religious person to look back ? Without retrospection it is not possible to harmonize the past and the present Without self-criticism the layers settled on religion cannot be removed. Egotism makes a man cruel. Cruelty gives rise to counter-violence. This is what is happening at present. The only remedy is tender-heartedness and tender-heartedness alone

Once Gautam asked Lord Mahavira, 'Lord ! What does one gain from tender-heartedness ?'

The Lord replied, 'Gautam ! Tender-heartedness puts an end to the feeling of separateness, the feeling that one is separate from others.'

No one in this world has come from God's home ? We are all human beings Therefore, each individual expects others to behave humanely

20

Lightness

Once a man was bathing in a pond. He took deep dips. Thus, for an hour he kept surfacing and dipping. At last he came out. While returning home he filled the pitcher with water and resting it on his shoulder he started walking home. His house was a little too far. He got tired on the way He started musing, 'When I dipped in the pond hundreds of tons of water was on my head, but I did not experience any heaviness. The pitcher cannot have more than ten to twelve kilos of water and yet it feels heavy. Why ?' Such a question is asked by everyone who delves into both limited and extensive areas.

In a pond water is unrestricted—its area is extensive—therefore, the pressure of its weight gets dispersed Water in a pitcher is restricted—its area is limited—therefore, the pressure of its weight gets concentrated. When wealth is accumulated in a few hands, it gives rise to pressures, tension and the feeling of heaviness, When wealth gets widely dispersed, the atmosphere becomes free from tension, pressure and the feeling of heaviness. That is why Lord Mahavira said, 'A man feels burdened by owning wealth (ऋद्धि-गौरव) and light by not doing so (ऋद्धि-लाघव)

When food products get concentrated in a few hands, the atmosphere becomes full of pressure, tension and heaviness. When food products get distributed among all, the atmosphere becomes free from pressure, tension and heaviness. That is why Lord Mahavira said, 'A man feels burdened by owning food products (रस-गौरव) and light by not doing so (रस-लाघव).

When happiness gets concentrated—leading to total disregard of the difficulties of others—the atmosphere becomes full of pressure, tension and heaviness When happiness is shared extensively—resulting in lack of interest in increasing the difficulties of others—the atmosphere becomes free from pressure, tension and heaviness. That is

why Lord Mahavira said, 'A man feels burdened by monopolizing happiness (सुख-गौरव) and light by not doing so (सुख-लाघव).

Ask any traveller on foot whether he wants to travel light or heavy. The answer will be, 'I want ot travel light.' How much burden do we put on our brain ? We carry a greater load of fancies than the load a donkey carries. We carry a greater load of plans than the load a camel carries We carry a greater load of beliefs than the load an elephant carries. Many people are heard saying they lack happiness and peace of mind They want peace but do not want to lighten the burden on the brain. They want happiness but do not want ot lighten the burden on the brain. A heavy body betokens illness; a light body betokens health A heavy mind betokens restlessness; a light mind betokens peace.

In the present industrial age there is an all round increase in tension—nervous tension, mental tension, interpersonal tension and business tension There is everywhere tension and the insanity born of tension. Is there any remedy for it other than lightness (reduction)

Filling a pitcher for one's own use and carrying that much load is understandable, but building a pond only for one's own use is incomprehensible and those doing so are destroying not only their own happiness and peace but the happiness and peace of the whole society

21

Truth

Truth is truly colossal It is a courageous effort to emcompass it within words. Man builds his house by enclosing infinite space. He illuminates it by getting a portion of sun's rays lighting infinite space. Then why can't we experience the colossal superhuman power by coming in contact with the periphery of Truth

Can anyone reach Truth without first destroying the armour of pertinacity. All those have fled away from Truth who have tried to see subjectively through their personal viewpoint. All those have got close to Truth who have tried to see it factually and objectively.

A housewife was once trying to pull a bo-tree by tying a rope round it. Her hands were profusely bleeding. Her body was trembling. Tears were rolling down her cheeks incessantly. Even then the obstinate bo-tree was simply refusing to budge an inch. A traveller passed by that place and saw everything that was going on. Gently he said, 'Sister ! What are you doing ?' She replied, 'Brother ! My mother-in-law had asked for the bo-tree and, therefore, I am trying to take it home But it is very obstinate It simply refuses to oblige me ' She once again pulled the rope but the tree did not move.

The traveller said, 'Sister ! The bo-tree will not go like this.' He climbed the tree, broke a branch and giving it to the housewife said, 'Take this bo-tree and give it to your mother-in-law.'

Acharya Bhikshu has described pertinacity born of ignorance (अज्ञानलब्ध-आग्रह) through the above tale. But this is not the only form of pertinacity There is also another type born of ownership.

Once a man was sitting and drinking water out of a small pond. The pond was almost dry because of the intense heat of the month of *Jeth* (May-June). Whatever was left was muddy. Just then a passer-by came there. He said, 'A little distance from here there is a big pond full of clean water. You should drink that. Why do you drink this muddy water ?' The first man replied, 'This small pond belongs to my father

and I will drink only its water.' Saying so he once again tried to drink the water

There is no dearth in this world of people who think and act in the above way. If there had been no pertinacity born of ownership, Truth would not have remained covered.

Pertinacity born of illusion is even more horrible Once a dog lived with a washerman. His name was Sataba. The washerman had two wives. They used to quarrel too much with each ther One of the abusive expressions they used for each other while quarrelling was 'You the wife of Sataba ' The dog became a victim of this illusion. They stopped feeding the dog and he became femished and infirm A neighbour's dog said to him. 'Come on, we will wander about and find something to eat ' The first dog replied, 'How can I go out leaving my two wives behind ?'

Pertinacity born of previous life's influences (संस्कार) is no less harmful Once an ant was going somewhere On the way it met another ant Both talked with each other. The incoming ant made inquiries about the well-beign of the outgoing ant The latter said, 'Sister ! Everything else is fine except that my mouth always tastes salty ' The former remarked, 'How can you avoid that taste since you live on a mountain of salt ? Come on with me I live on a mountain of sugar crystals There your mouth will taste sweet ' The latter readily accompanied the former But its mouth did not taste sweet even on the mountain of sugar crystals She said to the native ant. 'My mouth even now tastes salty ' The ant replied, 'I hope you haven't brought in your mouth a crystal of salt ' 'You are right, I have it in my mouth ' remarked the guest ant. Thereupon the native ant remarked, 'Sister ! How will your mouth taste sweet without giving up the salt ?'

No one can get liberated without ridding himself of prejudices

22

Restraint

The world would have been singularly governed by fear and terror had there been no restraint. If the river had not flown between the two banks, it would have done the people more harm than good. Our very being and life in society depend upon the restraints within which we live Consider the following scene Down below is flowing the Sabarmati river and over it is a railway bridge. On one side of it is broad-guage and on the other side metre-guage Nearby is a pathway for those going on foot and on bikes. Everyone is following the course meant for him/her No one is hindering the path of others Had it not been for this restraint through proper organization, the trains would have been hindered by the river waters and so would have been the case with people's movements. Man has learnt to observe restraint and so nothing is obstructed—the flow of the river, the railway traffic, the movements of the people.

In the *Gita* there is a mention of the restraint of a tortoise. The tortoise knows how to practise restraint It knows how to hide its organs under the security cover of its back. That is why it is able to protect itself againt the onslaught of jackals Both Lord Mahavira and Lord Buddha said in the same language. 'Restrain your hands, restrain your feet, restrain your speech, restrain you sense organs, and restrain your mind.'

Everyman seeks security Restraint is the greatest security. Germs do not cause as many people to fall ill as does non-restraint. Arms do not wound as many people as does non-restraint. The police force does not put as many people behind the bars as does non-restraint. Death does not claim as many victims as does non-restraint.

Physicians say, 'Of what you eat fifty per cent is for ourselves and fifty per cent for the doctors.' Food is not taken to nourish the entrails but to satisfy the palate. Food will not be as scarce as it is today only if considerations of satisfying the palate were removed from eating. When

all our attention is directed towards things we need to eat and drink, we are unable to fully concentrate on our basic need Such is the sad state today. Problems related to luxury and covetousness have relegated the problem of food to a secondary position. And the problem of food has made many secondary problems primary. India is still a country of scanty resources It is a pity that in such a country one class enjoys all kinds of luxuries and unnecessary things while another class suffers from the pangs of hunger Once Acharya Tulsi was staying in Rajasthan Some of his diciples were moving about on foot in another state. Acharyashree was told that they were facing inconvenience and not getting adequate food He reduced the quantity of his own food News of this sympathetic gesture reached the disciples. Their sense of hardship began mitigating. The feeling of hardship aggravates in the absence of sympathy, but on getting sympathy, even if hardship does not lessen, its feeling definitely gets attenuated. If the affluent people observe restraint, the hardship of the deprived people automatically gets reduced or even if it does not get reduced immediately, at least its feeling definitely gets less sharp. Abundance of earthly goods by itself does not solve all human problems Many problems can be solved by restraint alone Our economists talk merely of increased production of goods At such a time is it not necessary for our religious leaders to present the need for restraint in a scientific framework and to establish the fact that restraint solves not only mental but also physical problems When the regulations (worship aspect) become primary and restraint becomes secondary, the religious domain loses its lustre, and when restraint becomes primary and regulations become secondary, the religious domain becomes resplendent

23

Penance

Once a man was going somewhere It was midday of the month of *Jeth* (May-June). Dazzling sunshine and singeing winds. His body was veritably roasted How beautiful this world would have been if there had been no sun, he thought.

Then came the rainy season. The sky was overcast. The whole earth looked one sheet of water Days went by but the rain clouds showed no signs of vanishing. The sun became largely invisible. There was no full light, no sunshine and no singeing wind.

The same man went to a physician Interrogated by the physician he said, 'Sir, I am suffering from indigestion, so I have come to get some medicine.'

The physician said, 'Sethji (wealthy merchant), the weather is cloudy and the rays of the sun are not reaching the earth, which causes dyspepsia For this reason you should eat less.' The merchant returned home without any medicine On the way he was musing on how dangerous the world would be without the sun.

The sun is the source of our vital force Is austerity not a source of our vital force ? One who eates less is more healthy, balanced and happy than one who eats too much. Frugal eating is austerity *Acharang* says, 'Lord Mahavira was not ill; even then he ate frugally ' I shall reword it thus, 'The Lord ate frugally, so he was healthy ' Fasting has earned the status of a therapy But it is not merely a physical therapy It also dispels mental filth accumulated over a long period. Fasting is an austerity Mahatma Gandhi recognized disregard of the palate as a vow No sense organ can subdue a person who has conquered the palate Disregard of the palate is a great austerity.

Our body is extremely uncontrollable. Our sense organs are extremely uncontrollable. Our mind is very fickle A monkey is very volatile. Even his sitting quietly and steadily is volatility. Our unsteadiness is not natural like the volatility of a monkey. It is

purposive. We have to perfect our physical steadiness. It is an austerity. Austerity is not merely physical, it is also vocal and mental. Austerity is not dependent upon hunger If our mind is pure, we can observe austerity even on a well-fed stomach. On the other hand, if the mind is impure austerity cannot be observed even by keeping hungry.

Those creatures are very lucky who are gifted with speech. We establish contact with the external world through speech. Self-expression would have been severely restricted in the absence of speech It is speech which enables us to study. Studying implies embracing by countless persons the truth or experience realized by one preson This is vocal austerity. A drain helps water reach a piece of cultivated land. It is merely a means. The basic thing is the existence of water The well is full of water and the drain carries it to the cultivated land Speech too is a means Its source is the mind and the intellect Meditation is a mental austerity. Self-contemplation is an intellectual austerity Our vital force gets its nourishment from the sun Austerity gives nourishment to our spiritual force. The *Gita* says, 'There is the body The senses are prior to the body The mind is prior to the intellect.'

If only the body is subjected to austerity, egotism grows When both the body and the senses are subjected to austerity, restraint grows When the body, the senses and the mind are subjected to austerity, the door to spirituality opens When the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect are subjected to austerity, self realization takes place. It is a condition in which austerity finds itself richly rewarded

24

Sacrifice

Once I was sitting in a temple. It was evening time The priest came, lighted the lamp and performed the *aarti* (a ceremony in adoration of a deity by circular movement of a lighted lamp) and put the lamp on its stand. I was sitting by the stand I saw how a slender flame was dancing to the tune of the wind. It was giving out a slender flame of smoke also. I thought it was necessary to forsake what is worth forsaking. The lamp was giving light precisely because it is giving up what deserves to be given up We go for a morning walk We inhale gradually the vital air and then exhale it very gradually. While exhaling it is not only the vital air expelled but also the impure air with carbon. We keep healthy simply because we know how to forsake that which desrves forsaking

There is a principle of life-use and then abandon He who is acquainted with this principle has his life full of light, happiness and health. He who is not acquainted with this principle—he who knows only to take, to receive but not to give up—has no light, happiness and health in his life

Those who accumulate wealth but do not part with it are, as it were, neglecting light and filling themselves with smoke.

Those who keep adding to their power and do not give it up are, as it were, neglecting health and filling themselves with impure air

Sacrifice is reflected not only in the temple of spirituality but in every bit of our action and behaviour

No one not acquainted with the power of sacrifice can ever lead a life of freedom and honour. Dasharnabhadra was the ruler of Dasharnapur He came to pay obeisance to Lord Mahavira He was feeling wery proud of his glory and splendour Indra also came to pay obeisance to the Lord Seeing his glory and splendour Dasharnabhadra felt ashamed Pride grows in the presence of inferiors and declines in the presence of superiors Dasharnabhadra's pride suddenly declined. It was no longer possible to protect his honour. Dasharnabhadra

relinquished the power eclipsing light Indra bowed down before his spiritual splendour

Enjoyment extinguishes the lamp of bravery while sacrifice lights it. Life blossoms through sacrifice and withers through enjoyment.

Dasharnabhadra gave up not only state of power but also passion Sensual pleasure is in material pursuits and passion is within our minds Sacrifice consists in giving up sensual pleasures and rooting out passions. But if we keep passions active while giving up material pursuits, it is not real sacrifice but only its semblance.

The truth is that we do not know as much about giving up passions as we do about giving up material pursuits. That is why many times even in the act of sacrifice we experience non-sacrifice

Sacrifice is possible only when attachment is withdrawn from external things and turned inwards. A man while trying to free himself from passions said, 'Dear Anger ! Look for another victim Brother Honour ! You too depart And you, Madam Deception, cannot stay here Get out So also Friend Greed Now my attachment is directed inwards Therefore, you cannot coexit with such a situation '

Be alert to passion, its power will disappear, and obsession with material objects will automatically disappear

25

Celibacy

Once a man went to an anchorite (संन्यासी) and begged for some money The anchorite said that he possessed nothing. At the man's repeated insistence the anchorite said, 'Go and bring a stone lying on the river's bank ' He went and brought the stone The anchorite said, 'This is a *parasmani* (the mythical stone capable of converting iron onto gold) It can convert iron into gold ' The man felt overjoyed. He respectfully bowed his gratitude and walked back. Having walked some distance a doubt arose in his mind, 'If this stone is the best of its kind, why has the anchorite given it away ? Surely, He has something better than this.' He returned to the anchorite, respectfully bowed, and said, 'Respected ascetic, I do not want this *parasmani*, please give me that because of which you have rejected it '

There is no material power which can reject a *parasmani* Only spiritual power can do so as it views the *parasmani* of no more use than a stone I shall not object to your treating indulgence in sex as *parasmani*, but this is not the best thing to do, not the best means to happiness Once a man gets to know the real source of happiness, he rejects indulgence in sex in the same way in which the anchorite rejected the *parasmani*

The sages of the *Upanishads* sang 'आनन्दं ब्रह्म' Pure joy or bliss is Brahman. Had there been no bliss, our life would have been like an extinguished flame Out of our body is radiating a cluster of rays In our eyes is rippling light. What is all this ? It is the expression of our joy. A whole ocean of joy is undulating in our consciousness and our mind is impatiently looking for joy outside Our plight is exactly like that of a musk-deer The musk is in its navel, but it keeps wandering in search of it I am not saying that one finds no happiness in sensual pleasures. But the happiness so derived is not everlasting, is not free from the possiblity of resulting in physical and mental disaster Joy in the consciouness is self-generated and everlasting, and does not result in a

feeling of inertness and remorse.

Some psychologists believe that celibacy (ब्रह्मचर्य) means repressing desires and such repression leads to insanity. According to them celibacy is a negative or prohibitive activity. Therefore, they do not believe in its usefulness.

Indian thinking has been quite different from it. Indian thinkers regard celibacy as a creative power. It prohibits merely the external stimulants. Celibacy has an extensive creative power because it is the most effective means of developing and liberating the inner consciousness

The *yoga* teachers speak of seven *chakras* (ganglions) in the human body Among them the second one is called *swadhishthan* (स्वाधिष्ठान) It is a *kaam chakra* (काम चक्र)—sex ganglion. When it is not developed, a man indulges in sex. When we unite it with *vishuddha Chakra* (कंठ मनी), the source of our feeling of happiness undergoes a change It also changes if we develop *aagyaa chakra* (आज्ञाचक्र) or *bhoo chakra* (भ्रू-चक्र). According to psychology sex is sublimated. According to science of *yoga* the *kaam chakra* undergoes ascension (vertical movement) Because of this ascension our mind establishes contact with natural bliss. No one can become a celibate after closing the doors of joy Only by opening the doors of joy can one become a celibate

26

Art and the Artist

It would have been very fine if I had been an artist and had shed light on art But I am not an artist I am a spiritual practitioner (साधक). And I practise restraint not art But if I take a broad view of things I find that everyone having speech, hands, fingers, feet and other bodily organs is an artist Every man is an artist I am also an artist.

Since inception man has had a tendency towards communication or self-expression From non-manifest he wants to become manifest. Had it not been so, speech would not have developed In the absence of speech, thought would not have found expression Is manifesting the non-manifest and concretizing the abstract not an art ?

According to the *Upnishads* the origin of the universe is the primal art It occured to Brahma—'Let me manifest myself ' He manifested through name and form What else is universe ? It is nothing but name and form He alone is an artist who has something to express and who knows how to express it.

The artist first makes a sketch and then decorates or refines it Sometimes refinement changes the original form. A house is decorated Everything produced can be refined Refinement is a symbol of development

An art requires the use of hands, fingeres, feet, physical senses and the body. The Lord has taught us to restrain our hands, feet, speech, and senses.

The principle of art is : open your eyes and see The basic principle of restraint is : Close your eyes and see At the back of art is expression. Restraint inspires expression The two do not seem to be in harmony with each other. Everything has pairs of opposites. Even within an atom there are numberless pairs of opposites Nothing can exist without pairs of opposites

There is harmony between art and restraint also. Art means a harmonious activity. I have a viewpoint based on *syaadvad* (the doctrine

of qualified assertion) I see using the relative viewpoint that the development of art has occured through harmony. Truth is vaster than art When the two unite, life tends to develop An incense-stick when burnt (united with fire) emits fragrance. When Truth and Beauty combine, life is put on the road to development Welefare and life's development are not two different things Welfare is equivalent to the Good. The Good has to be consonant with the True and the Beautiful The True, the Good and the Beautiful can be in harmony only when life is motivated by the Good and the eyes face the Beautiful

27

Onesidedness of Faith

Some of our metaphysicians want to have pulp after destroying the peel The question is 'Is it possible ?' Have you ever seen a fruit having pulp but no peel ? As far as I know, to have pulp it is necessary to have peel Rejecting its necessity is tantamount to rejecting reality.

You go to a fruit market and buy oranges Oranges weighing a kilo have about half a kilo of peelings You do not eat the peelings; you throw it away Knowing fully well that you will have to throw away the peel, you buy oranges with peel and pay the fruiterer the cost of a kilo of oranges You accept the usefulness of the peel and pay for it because you know that the cut-slices of oranges cannot survive without the peel You do throw away the peel but only when it comes to you for eating.

I am comparing the peel with external observances and the pulp with spiritual bliss or self-realization Self-realization comes by degrees I concede that, external observances do not constitute sef-realization. But I have no solid proof for accepting that they are not a means to self-realization. I also concede that the peel has to be given up But won't you accept that it cannot be given up before the fruit ripens ? Every voyager has to give up the ship after reaching the shore, but how can it be given up in midstream ? Shall we accept that the ship has no use for reaching the shore ? The role of the worthless and the useless is not single and absolute It is multiple and relative.

One who has fulfilled the role of spiritual realization has not use of external observances But how can their usefulness be denied for someone who has embarked on the course of spiritual realization ? Fruition is aborted if the peel is removed prematurely Abandoning the ship prematurely results in drowning

The metaphysical truth which Acharya Rajneesh and Kanji Swamy are expounding can be compared with the following precept 'Since we have the strength to swim, the ship is not necessary for us, which amounts to denying the need for the peel ' Shall I hold their

exposition as untrue ? Is there any exposition in which a *syaadvadi* (one who asserts probability) will not find a fraction of truth ? The above exposition has truth in it but it relates to the explanation of our existence, not to its achievement. Consciousness is full of knowledge, philosophy, bliss and power In the beginning it is non- manifest. It manifests itself by degrees through the devoted practice of spiritual accomplishment. This practice has three parts :

1. Right faith
2. Right knowledge
3. Right conduct

Among them Right Faith is basic Only after acquiring it does one acquire Right Knowledge and Right Conduct In its absence the other two cannot be acquired But this sequential relationship does not mean that once the Right Faith has been acquired Right Knowledge becomes perfect. There is a very wide gap between Right Faith and the perfection of Right Knowledge All that happens is that on the attainment of Right Faith, the falsehood of knowledge disappears But knowledge does not become fully manifest and clear It becomes so through the acquisition of Right Conduct

The sequential relationship between Right Faith and Right Conduct does not mean that the former automatically generates the latter Right Conduct is acquired only when the soul becomes concentrated on itself—when self-knowledge is acquired If self-knowledge and self-love were to yield the same result, everyone concentrating on himself would have become free from all ignorance and passions. But this is not the case Even after acquiring Right Faith, passions are not enfeebled and in the presence of passions Right Knowledge does not manifest itself. If one could acquire all having acquired Right Faith, the period of penance and spirituality would have become redundant But this is not true of real life The need for long spiritual practice remains even after attaining Right Faith Even after acquiring perfection of Right Faith perfection of Right Knowledge is not achieved Even after acquiring perfection of Right Knowledge perfect stoppage of *Karmik* influx is not attained, and liberation is not possible without perfect cessation of *Karmik* influx. There is no principle that perfection of Right Knowledge and perfect cessation of *Karmik* influx are ensured by perfection of Right Faith The principle is that perfection of Right knowledge is impossible without perfection of Right Faith and perfect cessation of *Karmik* influx is impossible without perfection of Right Knowledge

Lord Mahavira had acquired Right Faith. Even after acquiring Right Conduct he performed spiritual practice full of penance for a period of twelve and a half years. The proposition that there is no need of fasting, abstinence from sinful activities by attaining fusion with the true self. etc., is likely to make a person inactive and disloyal to tradition and scriptures, and is incapable of animating his creative consciousness.

A harmonious state of Right Faith, Right Knowledge, and Right Conduct is essential for building creative consciousness. The first part of the principles of its exposition will state that a man should not remain confined to the peel—he should reach the pulp and enjoy it. The second part will state that a man should not deny the usefulness of the peel. The roles of the cover and the content should not be allowed to overlap

On the one hand we have people who swear by the practical aspect They see no cause in relation to the purpose and no inner soul in relation to the external environment On the other hand we have people who see everything from a realistic viewpaint. They believe that there is nothing beyond the cause and the inner soul. Purpose and environment have no usefulness Both viewponts represent extreme ends of the truth. They are not mutually blended and , therefore, represent fragmented truth The perfect truth is that every cause existing within the 'influence-zone' of the target or purpose is affected by the latter, while any causes existing outside that zone is not affected by purpose The former is an accidental state while the latter is natural Those given to one-sided exposition superimpose the natural state on the accidental one. To attain the natural state is our end but at present we have no means to attain it. At present, we are in the accidental state. After attaining the natural state we are not affected by the purpose. But it is an imposed and not a real belief that we are not influenced by the purpose while we are in the accidental state

Man has a good deal of reactive tendency. For the ordinary man it is not easy to grasp the subtle, therefore, he is more insistent on the gross or the physical. A progressive person (in the spiritual sense) does not find much substance in the physical; therefore, he is insistent on the subtle In an age overwhelmingly given to worshipping the subtle, men start getting inclined towards the physical Likewise, when there is overwhelming worship of the physical, people start getting inclined towards the subtle. Both these tendencies are reactive characteristics of one-sided behaviour. The way out is a balance view of the gross and

the subtle The end is subtler, more longterm and more difficult than the means. From the grossest to the grosser and from the grosser to the gross marks a forward journery from where we take a new turn towards the realm of the subtle

One who worships fire cannot experience coolness because coolness and heat are mutually contrary qualities Then how can a worshipper of darkness obtain light ? Our soul in its pure form is characterized by stillness. That *is* our goal Activeness is the opposite of inactiveness Then how can we progress towards inativeness (stillness) through activeness ? The two would become distinguishable if activeness were to be the means of attaining stillness.

It is difficult to ridicule the above method of questioning I have no argument to support the proposition that one can obtain light through darkness But I am also not prepared to accept that there exists extreme opposition (contradictoriness) between activeness and stillness Inactiveness is different from activeness but is not the absence of activeness One who exists cannot be inactive and one who is inactive cannot exist Existence and inactiveness are mutually contradictory The characteristic of Truth is activeness Truth cannot be explained without activeness The soul when liberated does not become inactive, it remains active It is regarded inactive because it has been freed from certain activities The liberated soul becomes active because it has freed itself from eating, but it remains constantly active because of the unceasing cognitive activity It is deprived of the joy of drinking water as a result of the absence of thirst, but it is never deprived of spontaneous spiritual joy

Our existence is given to activeness and will remain active under all circumstances Activeness is our spontaneous nature It will never change. Change can occur only in activities When one activity ceases and another begins, in the light of the subsequent change we disregard the earlier activity and call that state inactiveness With such extensive understanding of activity we arrive at the truth that activeness is the cause not only of bondage but also of liberation It is not only darkness but also light. We can sum up the foregoing discourse by saying that a particular kind of liberated state can be accomplished by a particular kind of activeness This principle is not of achieving inactiveness through inactiveness but of achieving a specific type of activeness through a particular type of activeness According to this principle activity is not altogether forbidden, but a specific type of activity is prohibited Activity likely to defeat the goal is prohibited,

while activity likely to promote the goal is accepted. Pure actions cannot be held to be opposed to spiritual purity. That is why activeness in our world is not to be altogether avoided. On the attainment of subtle activeness, gross activeness automatically ceases But any effort to relinquish gross activeness before accomplishing subtle activeness can be suicidal

28

Truth, Sect and Tradition

The lamp of the curiosity for truth has extinguished in the people who believe that they should say and do what has been said and done conventionally By their own admission such people have attained truth. There is nothing left for them to attain, not even truth But the question arises, 'Have we attained the whole truth ? If we indeed have, then no more spiritual and austere practice is needed For, such practice is needed when we accept the truth already attained and seek that which still remains unattained.

The world of religion has bred a great illusion It is based on wrong insistence If one insists that what one believes is true, it may be unobjectionable But if one insists that all belief other than one's own are untrue, it cannot be unobjectionable. At present most insistence is of the latter type Therefore, sects are mutually antagonistic

Sects are the vehicles of tradition Powerful Acharya's doctrine brings into being a sect and following it gives rise to tradition Every sect and tradition represents a fragment of truth Some sects are representative of greater fragments than others But complete truth dawns only with self-awakening A seeker after truth is primarily oriented towards the end and only secondarily towards the means, whereas a sectarian person is primarily oriented towards the means and only secondarily towards the end

It is also a mistake to believe that no one subscribing to a sect can be a seeker after truth and no one outside a sect can be falsely insistent or traditional. If sects and curiosity for truth had been mutually inconsistent, either sects would have become extinct or nothing would have been left of curiosity for truth Both exist It means that there is no inherent contradiction between sects and curiosity for truth.

The antagonism between sects is not because they support different viewpoints, but because their followers have little curiosity for truth.

If we want sects to integrate, harmonize and be friendly towards one another, it is necessary first to wish that the sectarian people should have curiosity for truth roused in them. I shall show how weak this curiosity is today with the help of the mental state of Jain sects.

At present people start entertaining all kinds of doubts even at the slightest change in the style and conduct of Jain monks. Everyone asks the same question, 'How has it come about ? This was not done earlier, then why is it being done now ?' It is rarely asked whether what is being done is right or wrong. It is possible to deeply deliberate over and investigate the right and the wrong, but it is not possible to do so in the case of what in the past was not what now is.

It is because of this mentality that Jain Acharyas hesitate to make even desirable changes. It is not wise to change a living, vibrant tradition, nor is it wise not to change a moribund tradition.

At present many Jain thinkers and scholars are nurturing this doubtful state of mind whereby, though convinced of the inaptness of the given mode of interpretation, they hesitate to change it simply because it has been in vogue for a very long time A tradition acquires an invariable status of being perennial, if it has been nurtured for a long time and has been assimilated by generations of people. But the dictates of truth are different No man-made law is permanent or eternal. Anything created by man is limited in time. Only that is timeless whcih has not been made—which is natural. No tradition is independent of space, time and circumstances Let us consider *Paryushan* or *Samvatsari* (the annual ceremony of worship). *Paryushan* is indicative of a two thousand five hundred years old state of the rainy season. Today all kinds of myths have been added to it. As a result it is highly controversial. Different traditions set its date as the fourth, fifth and the fourteenth day of the lunar calender. Even among those who subscribe to the fifth day, there are those who calculate the new day with the rise of the sun and those who calculate it according to the change of date in the time pieces. The basic element of *Paryushan* has been lost and the time when it should be observed has become all important Similarly innumerable other questions which were secondary have become primary and those which were primary have become secondary. Right answers to these questions can be found only by relating tradition with truth. The truth we could not discover until yesterday can be discovered tomorrow. Research and achievements in the field of truth will continue so long as man exists.

Many of our problems will be solved if we evince as much faith

in the truth yet unknown as we do in that already known. The royal road to the accomplishment of truth is the awakening of spritual consciousness The sharper our spiritual experience, the less wrongly insistent our intellect. There is no greater hindrance to truth than wrong insistence Such an insistence is nourished by an intellect not refined by spiritual concern We should give primacy to the processes of spiritual development if we want to see unity and end of illwill among religious sects. Whether we know it or not, the development of the above processes is tantamount to the development of unity and harmony and their decline means the decline of unity and harmony.

29

Perennial Truth and Age-specific Truth

Truth has been being discussed ever since the development of men's intellect There are three schools in philosophy regarding truth—eternalism, non-eternalism and eternal-non-eternalism

Exponents of the first school are topmost eternalists They believe that the essential or basic element is totally eternal with no room whatsoever for variation.

Exponents of the second school are those who believe that things die, i e , change every moment Whatever is undergoes change every moment, they say

Exponents of the third school are those who believe in the doctrine of manifold aspects They accept every element as both eternal and ephemeral (non-eternal).

Clarity in the use of language is dependent upon space, time and the individual user Right interpretation is not possible without this context Even the expression, 'I shall go,' does not carry full meaning unless it is made clear when and where I shall go.

Take this sentence 'So and so is not here.' The above sentence does confirm the person's existence but he/she is not where we want to see him/her. This is spatial transience The sentence, 'At present it is not,' denotes temprol transience. That which is not subject to space and time is eternal/perennial The perennial is present at all times and in all places All elements are eternal As much as was there in the world shall remain undiminished. Not even an atom is added or reduced. The basic element is eternal and its extension belongs to a particular period.

Most religious people regard their regulations eternal Unthinkingly everything can be called eternal, but can any material extension be ever eternal ? We say, 'Religion is perennial.' After all what is religion as such ? Man presents every fact through language.

When language itself in non-eternal how can regulations and definitions couched in language be eternal ?

Eternal is that which is natural. Religion—the natural purity of the soul—is eternal. But how can regulations and definitions framed to interpret religion be eternal ? Has any defination of religion given so far been eternal ? That which is made is not eternal. Defintions are man-made, so they cannot be eternal. It is said that non-violence, truth, etc. are eternal. But the question is 'What after all is non-violence ?' Eternality ends where there is form or shape Non-violence as the soul's naturalness can be eternal.

Memory traces (*samskara*) always take one back into the past Communists, even though not believing in the scriptures, appeal in their name The great thinker Mao says that Russia has become revisionist because it has strayed from Lenin's doctrines. On the one hand they reject scriptures and on the other they keep sticking to them China changed the feudal tradition, but the doctrine applied for bringing about the change came to be regarded as eternal

Shankaracharya has placed the passion for the scriptures in the same category as that of passion for sexual indulgence. Man is very adept in the use of words. He has a great attachment to the past, to what he has been accustomed to, and to what is ancient He is not attached to the topical so much as he is to the distant past. He lives in the present but is more inclined towards the past Therefore, he finds it difficult to understand truths newly revealed That which has outlived its utility can claim our respect, but not magisterial authority

It is not wise to cling to a thing that has outlived its utility. Only those people develop who think of changes Those people are always losers who mistakes the transient for the eternal and do not change it

30

Insistence and Non-insistence

Development is the first maxim of insistence and the first maxim of development is non-insistence Both insistence and non-insistence are very useful Development ceases if one of them is planted where other is needed

Insistence enjoys universal approval. Take the individual who is a citizen of India. If he does not insist on preserving the security of the country, will it be possible to preserve India's sovereignty ?

Take another individual whose mother-tongue is Bengali If he lacks insistence vis-a-vis Bengali, will its development be possible ?

Here in another individual who is *Kshatriya* (the warrior caste) by caste Will the future of his caste be bright if he is not earnest about it ?

Yet another individual is a follower of the Jain religion Will the existence of the Jain religion continue to be effective if he lacks zeal for it ?

No individual can be loyal to anybody unless he is earnest at least in relation to some one cause. He will not belong to any country, caste or religion Even though formally connected with some country, language, caste and religion, he will not be able to do any good to them In the light of the above, it is very necessary to have insistence

If there had been non-insistence on the creation of Pakistan in the mind of Mr Jinnah, the helmsman of Pakistan, that country would never have come into existence

The war between north and south Vietnam is going on merely on the basis of ideological insistence.

Two factors of the Communist Party—rightists and leftists—too have come into being on the basis of ideological insistence

Again, it is ideological insistence which has been responsible for the world's division into two camps—democratic and communist

To harmonize these variant forms of insistence and to assess their rightness or wrongness is not free from controversies. In the context of

our presentation there is no tendency to evaluate customary events on the basis of a single criterion The theoretical formulation of insistence and non-insistence can be free from controversy.

In the quest for truth our mind should be free from insistence One should of course insist on following the available truth Without doing so we can know truth, but cannot imbibe it

We can solve all our problems if we insist on truth.

31

The Spiritual Point

1. Space is not only this much

I am acquainted with the truth that space is infinite. Even then I have been trying to confine it. I have confined space and I call it my house. My house has space but space is not limited to my house. It is outside the house too My house gives me refuge, protects me from the sun, gives me shelter against heat and cold, and so I call it mine and protect it But I have no right to think that there is no space in another man's house

A religious person is he who is curious to know truth, who investigates truth, and who follows truth. For a man to be regarded religious without his being curious to know truth is like expecting a lamp to emit light even though it has no flame To say that a man is religious even though he has no inclination to investigate truth is to say that one has found the right place without finding the right way To say that a man is religious even though he does not follow truth is to say that the thirst has been quenched without drinking any water

2. Philosophy

Let us see and think. When we see, we are unable to think, and when we think, we are unable to see. When our mind is without thoughts, we are in a position to see and when we see, our mind automatically becomes free from thoughts. Thought-restraint has a natural formula—seeing.

Seeing needs no language. Thinking needs language. Absence and presence of language are two different states Deep investigation automatically helps engage in concentration. Whether we look after or near, whether we look into the body or at external objects, everything relates to the present. We can see neither the past nor the future.

3. Sight and Action

Today the whole world is afflicted with problems. It looks as though a play was being staged. In it the seer has submerged and the scene has emerged on the surface This is the state of deep sleep. The day man wakes up the problem will solve itself The existence of the scene is eternal. It shall never vanish No effort need be made to make it vanish All we need to do is to define the relation between the seer and the scene It will be an unnatural relationship if the seer fogets his existence in experiencing the scene It is this that is the root cause of the problem. The harmonious relationship between the two comprises the blending of the seer's experience of his own self with that of the scene.

When the seer and the scene are disunited, whatever man sees he does not do and whatever he does he does not see This is a deceitful state In it seeing and doing are divorced from each other. When the seer and the scene are united, man does only what he sees and sees only what he does This is a morally upright state In it seeing and doing are not divorced from each other.

4. Individualism

O Sun ! I do not like you You are the very soul of light The whole earth is illuminated by your light Darkness disappears.

You are the very awakening of the soul With your rise people who are asleep wake up Sleep disappears.

You are the very soul of fearlessness. With your appearance the doors of the houses are opened up Fear disappears.

You are the Primum Mobile With your emergence the whole sky is filled with birds and all roads by people. Inactivity is transformed into activity

Even then I do not like you, the reason being that you want to shine alone by outshining or covering with darkness all other planets How can anyone like someone bent upon covering with darkness the entire community ?

The sun wants to shine alone, therefore he may be cruel

No one wishing to possess everything and not sharing it with others in the community can do so without being cruel. Therefore, nonviolence and non-possession are interdependent in a man No individual lacking the feeling of nonviolence or the feeling of equality can keep himself away from possession It is violence and inequality which occasion possession

5. The joy of imperfection

If men became perfect, where would, thus, be room for human effort ? Fuel is essential for fire. If people did not feel hungry, they would lie idle. They wake up because they have to satiate hunger Workers rise early because they have to go to their factories. Teachers are in a hurry because they have to go to their colleges and teach. Likewise, farmers have to go to their fields If people became perfect, they would idle away their time. Human effort has its basis in imperfection Real joy lies in remaining imperfect, not in perfection Leave perfection to God, for human beings only imperfection is desirable If there had been no imperfection, no community would have formed If the tent could be erected on a single pillar, many pillars would not have been needed. If man could walk on a single foot, there would have been no need for two feet The other is needed—this precisely is relativity With imperfection is associated relativity It is surprising that even though imperfect, man thinks in absolute terms he boasts of a house worth a million rupees, but is not worried about the dirty drain just outside his house Can he remain unaffected by its poisonous fumes ?

Now-a-days people living in palatial mansions do so behind closed windows, because electricity and fans provide the inmates with light and air respectively They are cut off from ordinary people. Man today has grown so individualistic that he remains insular. But can anyone who by nature is imperfect survive by severing his relations with the world

6. Sources of contact

Our consciousness has two forms manifest consciousness and non-manifest consciouness. Psychology divides the mind into three parts unconscious, subconscious and conscious. Non-manifest consciousness is a refulgent solar ball, a sea of light.

Yesterday I saw the river brimming with water Nearby were a few drains They had only that much water as was their holding capacity. The flow of water and electricity is similar We have six instruments of manifesting consciousness—five senses and the mind They are six sources of contact They are very efficient in helping us establish contacts with the external world When I use my eyes, the whole world becomes visible to me. When I speak, I turn into a speaker and you an audience. Through these senses my inner being gets related to the external world

7. Science and Spirituality

It is man's nature to wish to know the unknown That is why in him was developed the habit of researching into truth. Integrated truth comprises both spirituality and science.

Ever since man has acquired knowledge he has also made experiments Experimental knowledge is science. Knowledge based on belief is not science. In logic it is called an error. Even science first assumes facts and then verifies them experimentally. That which is not so verified proves itself untrue

Scientific knowledge is acquired through the processes of analysis and synthesis and the results obtained through them Spiritual knowledge is obtained through direct experience. It is this which constitutes the main difference between the two

8. Fasting upto Death

Fasting unto death means killing the self—this I could understand, but I could not understand what 'self' is I have taken the body itself as 'self' Therefore, I have come to treat the destruction of the body itself as the killing of self. Is self not the lamp of consciousness ? Is self not the ventilator of philosophy ? Is self not a storehouse of purity ? The object of carrying the burden of the body is to ensure that the lamp of consciousness remains lighted, the ventilator of philosophy remains open, and the storehouse of purity remains full. If the above object is defeated, if the lamp is extinguished, the ventilator is closed, the storehouse is emptied, the limits of carrying the burden of the body are automatically transgressed

III

Sixteen Formulas for Mental Peace

(A twenty-one-day *Anuvrat* camp was organised in Delhi in 1966. It was joined by many people. Many citizens also kept coming and going. Shri Jainendra Kumar Jain was one of the participants. Dada Dharmadhikari stayed there for a week. Two hours in the morning were fixed for discussions and seminars. Many intellectually and spiritually oriented people took part in them

Views expressed during these discussions and seminars are reproduced in the following pages)

1

Cleaning the Stomach

Stomach is a means of a happy and healthy life Most diseases are caused by stomach disorders The root of good health lies in the stomach Cleaning the stomach involves three things—food, elimination, and regularity

Food

Most people eat in an unregulated manner, sometimes less, at other times more; sometimes unwholesome, at other times unbalanced According to physicians the food eaten should be neither too much nor too little Eating less than necessary also obstructs its elimination. Excessive eating is of course wrong from every point of view The food eaten goes into the stomach which can liquefy it only according to its power Too much intake of food results in inadequate liquefaction which is called mucous The accumulation of mucous causes many disorders like stomach ache, flatulence and headache.

Untimely eating is wrong. By untimely eating is meant eating a second time before the earlier food has been digested If possible, the interval between two meals should be five or at least three hours This has been a common restraint Some light items of food take less time to digest, but it takes at least three hours for proper digestion Before this period mucous is present in the liquefied food In olden times people mostly used to eat twice and sometimes thrice daily But nowadays a different principle is followed. Many doctors advise to eat small quantities at frequent intervals Perhaps they think of light stuff Patients suffering from peptic ulcers require frequent eating. In another disease where food is digested too quickly. Whatever is eaten is all lost. These two diseases are of a serious nature. Smaller ailments are forgotten in the presence of bigger ailments.

Food is also related to seasons The quantity of gastric juices diminishes in the rainy season That is why penance is easier to perform in this season As compared to winter less gastric juices are secreted in summer This is reflected in the quality and quantity of food needed in the two seasons. Overeaters cannot put in much mental labour Those who eat lightly can do it more efficiently They do not feel handicapped because of proportionate circulation of blood. During cogitation and deliberation there is a greater flow of blood towards the brain with the result that intestines get a meagre supply of it On eating two much more blood flows towards the stomach with the result the brain gets a meagre supply of it The mind gets enfeebled for want of adequate supply of blood. The quantity of food required is determined on the basis of the expenditure of energy needed. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of food differ in the case of those who do mental and physical labour Frequent drinking of tea is also not useful for health It may stimulate temporarily but it is not useful for real strength, intelligence and virility

Elimination

More important than food is its elimination. It is certainly important to eat properly, but more important is timely elimination of what is eaten

Less attention is paid to elimination Improper or defective elimination results in the anal air becoming foul It results in loss of mental joy There is a deep relation between the anal centre and mental happiness Normally the useless elements of what we eat are eliminated in twenty-four hours, failing which they do get eliminated in three days' time Should the feaces not move out of the intestines even in three days, the result is torpor, inactivity and loss of intelligence

The large intestines eliminate the feaces through an undulating motion Their movement becomes weak due to three reasons (a) advancing age, (b) suppression of the natural urge, and (c) overeating

With advancing age intestines go on weakening. This weakness due to advancing age can be remedied by *Yoga Mudra*.

Suppression of the natural urge

If timely elimination is not done, the intestines stop signalling. Many people suppress the urge for elimination because of either unavoidable circumstances or carelessness. Neglecting the intestinal signals too often results in the stoppage of the signals.

Many people take pride in saying, 'We do not have any urge for elimination for two or three days But they forget that they have lost the

capacity to register the urge by neglecting the intestinal signals.

Excessive eating

Excessive eating makes the intestines very weak. They become incapable of moving the feaces, which leads to constipation, which in turn blunts thinking For the feeling of happiness it is necessary to avoid the accumulation of faeces. Even not eating for two days leaves food in the intestines to be digested, but a lot of restlessness is felt if the elimination does not take place. Stuffing of the intestines by faeces obstructs the anal passage. It in turn makes the anal gas upwards and puts pressure on the heart, which is very often mistaken for a heart attack. Food which has a higher or lower temperature than one's body temperature also proves harmful It damages both the teeth and the intestines. Food is related to one of our basic needs, but when it gets related to the palate, propriety is transgressed and perverted

Regularity

It relates to regularity in daily activities like sitting, standing, sleeping, walking, etc Just as overeating is harmful, oversitting is also extremely harmful to health. It adversely affects the gastric juices and for this reason careful people get up and walk a few steps after every one and a half or two hours of sitting. Oversitting is undoubtedly a very big cause of diseases, but it does not mean that walking or standing throughout the day is good for health. It also weakens our vitality In fact balance has to be maintained in everything.

Those people work against the principles of good health who do not practise *Yogic postures* or who do not walk. These activities help bowel movement *Yogmudra* is also very useful for this purpose. Whatever be the form of exercise, if it is not undertaken, all kinds of physical ailments result. The blood thickness and people are afflicted by serious diseases like arthritis etc.

Sleep is very useful for health. It is the golden formula of a long life. Sir Winston Churchil had a long life and its biggest secret was good sleep. He often dictated messages lying. One might ask if reading while lying is good. No, it is very dangerous for the eyes. Too much lying is also not good. The good lies not in the activity but in its right proportion.

Somebody told me that a high support to the head (while lying) obstructs blood circulation. Since in our whole body (the head is one part where blood circulation is even normally less, it becomes even more difficult to reach the head if it is rested on a high pillow. I felt

there was a lot of truth in it. There are people who advise the non- use of a pillow as part of their therapy

Question : Some people keep reading for long time awaiting sleep. It puts pressure on the nerves of the eyes and hastens sleep. Is it a proper procedure ?

Answer : I don't have any such experience How can then I say whether it is right or wrong ? However, I can say that keeping the body and the eyes free from tension—performing *Kayotsarga*—is a right procedure To be worried about sleep is to keep sleep away. Practise *Kayotsarga* and everything will take care of itself.

Sleep is very essential for health. Since all activities produce toxic substances in the body, physicians have extensively investigated this phenomenon They have even identified many types of toxic substances. Through sleep we expel these toxic substances and also compensate the energy loss suffered during the day. Inadequate sleep causes constipation disturbing the balance of the healthy body

Now I want to leave these incidental matters discussed above and to once again touch upon the basic theme There is a very deep relation between the mind and the body. Each influences the other The centre of the body's purity is the abdomen Therefore, if one were to talk of mental peace outside the context of the cleaning of the stomach, the talk would lack proper basis

2

Purifying the Senses

Many people are heard complaining that their resolution (will-power) does not endure. It is repeatedly defeated. We have to think as to why it happens so.

Deeply deliberating over the causes of the defeat of resolution Acharya Shubh Chandra has written :

'अनिरुद्धाक्षसन्ताना:, अजीतोग्रपरीषहा: ।
अत्यक्तचित्तचापल्या:, प्रस्खलन्त्यात्मनिश्चये॥'

Those people's resolution is defeated who have not controlled their sensual urges, who have not subjugated the senses, who have not practised mortification and who have not overcome mental distractions.

Today, we have to deliberate on the first cause. How should one control or subjugate the sensual arges ? According to human physiology man is bestowed with five senses—those of touch (skin), taste (tongue), smell (nose), sight (eyes), and hearing (ears). When it comes to using them, man becomes a single-sense person in as much as only one sensation is felt at any one time.

There are two types of senses—perceptive and sensory. Two of the senses—the ears and the eyes—are not sensory; they are only perceptive. The remaining three are sensory That the mango is sweet and the lemon sour is perception (knowledge derived through the senses). This experience is possible only through eating. Sensation is impossible without direct relationship. On the other hand, perceptive senses can also register their subject from after. Sensory senses have to create a direct contact with their subjects.

Senses are neither good nor bad in themselves. They become one or the other in association with the mind. Senses perceive the present, while the mind perceives all the three—past, present and future. If the mind is not associated with the eye, nothing is registered even when the eye is open. Senses become dynamic only when related to the mind. Therefore, cleanness of the senses is automatically derived from the

cleanness of the mind.

In ancient literature there is a mention of repressing the senses Today repression (दमन) is regarded as a bad word because repression is taken to mean tyranny. This represents corruption of the meaning of the word. On the other hand, subduing the passions (शमन) has a positive connotation. But in Sanskrit the two words 'repression' (दमन) and 'subduing '(शमन) do not differ in meaning. शमु दमु च उपशमे—both words have the same meaning. Sprinkling of a few drops of water 'subdues' the boiling over of milk. Similarly, the intense drives of the senses are repressed or subdued. Repression does not mean oppression or tyranny.

The senses are oriented externally Repressing them means bringing them back inside and depositing them firmly in their respective containers. To subject them to discomfort and prevent them from functioning amounts to escapism. There is no room for religion where there exists a feeling of pain and suffering Religion means a feeling of bliss and it is possible only when one is totally absorbed in one's self

Question : Is there no sense of suffering in leading the life of a monk ?

Answer : I don't think there is

Question · Is there no possibility of a monk facing pain and suffering ?

Answer Pain and suffering do occur, but their occurrence is not the same as being absorbed in them. Many painful things were encountered by Lord Mahavira during his period of practising penance But he could not have faced them successfully if he had allowed himself to be absorbed in them He faced them undaunted because he was absorbed in his own self.

While undergoing surgery a patient was anaesthetized. His abdomen was ripped open A person was standing there. He began shaking at the very thought of the pain he imagined the patient should be suffering. But the patient had no feeling of pain. The instrument of his sensation of pain had been neutralized. Under the circumstances the impression of pain lies in the onlooker not in the patient

Similarly, the intensity of the suffering encountered by Lord Mahavira was felt by the onlookers not by him. Suffering unless felt will have no being, It is because it is felt.

Jainendra · If absorption in one's self is a state similar to that of anaesthesia, I cannot persuade myself into liking it. It lacks the dynamic of consciousness. And in my opinion there can be no spirituality in the

absence of the dynamic of consciousness.

Muni Shree · I am not sying that absorption in the self is anaesthesia of consciousness. What I am saying is that when absorption in the self becomes deeply concentrated, consciousness grows so puissant that it automatically gets insulated from external stimuli.

Jainendra : Some people regard the use of intoxicants as part of practising spiritual accomplishment. Why are they wrong ?

Muni Shree : They are wrong because by the use of intoxicants consciousness is stupefied.

Jainendra · Do you not like the stupefaction of consciousness ?

Muni Shree · No, not at all

Jainendra . O.K , then please carry on.

Muni Shree · In my opinion absorption in the self is not a state in which consciousness is divested of puissance by insulating it from external stimuli Absorption in the self is that state in which external stimuli become destitute (infructuous) in the face of the puissance of consciousness.

The body, the senses and the mind are not inimical to the soul. They lack consciousness while the soul is conscious. Both of them have their separate existence Both are possessed of their own characteristics. To consider them antagonistic will be a wrong notion When senses orient themselves towards the external world, desire is born. When desire is born man starts treating senses as inimical. Let us try to know why they orient towards the external world. Simply because we are not deeply attached to the soul We are attached to the external world. Doctors and parents repeatedly stop the child from eating certain things when he is not healthy. They would not prohibit him if he had no attachment to eating Since he has a strong urge to eat, doctors and parents have to stop him As the doctor's prohibition is related to the child's attachment, in the same way restraint is related to the individual's attachment. The child is ignorant Therefore, he is stopped by others But wise men themselves stop themselves from succumbing to attachment. It is this that is called restraint.

Question : Is restraint altogether absolute ?

Answer . It is not absolute but relative.

Question : How long is restraint required ?

Answer : Restraint is required so long as there is attachment As soon as attachment loses its force, restraint has accomplished its purpose. It is one's existence that has an absolute value. It alone lasts. Restraint is not bondage. It is liberation, liberation whose source is love.

'अनुरागाद् विरागः' —This is the principle of restraint. If we love something, we automatically develop aversion to its opposite. Love for the inner self (soul) leads to aversion to the external world; love for the external world leads to aversion to the inner self. And aversion to the external world means restraint. Likewise, aversion to the inner self means non-restraint. No control is exercised from the side of love; it comes from the side of aversion. As spirituality gains in strength, restraint grows too and the need for regulations decreases. As spirituality loses its strength, restraint decreases and the need for regulations increases. The wide gap between restraint and regulations is explained, thus, in *Acharang Sutra* : नेव से अन्ते नेव से दूरे. One who has accepted regulations but has not renounced sensuality is neither 'far' nor 'near' Being bound to external regulations, he is not in a state to indulge in sensual pleasures and being not free from desires he is not in a state to renounce sensual pleasure. Therefore, he is neither away from sensuality nor close to it.

Religion has two forms : conventional and self generated. Religion is in reality born of the soul. The situation is comparable to the well water being undesirable and unacceptable, and the rain water being desirable and acceptable. Religion has a natural effect Regulations can form banks, they cannot be the main source of water.

Question · Does renunciation (वैराग्य) cause abnegation (त्याग) or does abnegation cause renunciation ? Similarly, does restraint (संयम) cause regulation (नियम) or does regulation cause restraint ?

Answer I find it difficult to say that abnegation results in renunciation and regulation leads to restraint. The basis of renunciation and restraint is love—this I have said earlier. Deep love for one and aversion to or renunciation of another Love of self, renunciation of non-self Love of religion, aversion to irreligion. Everyone can practise renunciation and everything can be renounced. Renunciation in love (the two being two sides of the same coin) is the only principle capable of purifying the senses.

The problem of purification of senses

The visible world is characterized by sound, form, taste, smell and touch. We come into its contact through our senses. There is no direct relation of the mind with the visible world. its relation is established only through the senses. The relation of sound, form, taste, smell, and touch with the senses cannot be prevented. But the attachment to them

can be prevented. At one place in *Uttaradhyayan* a disciple asks the Acharya : 'Revered One ! What does one get by having intense love for religion ?' The Acharya replies, 'Having deep love for religion gives happiness—aversion to sensual pleasures.' It is the same principle—love for religion and aversion to the external world. This is also the call of restraint. The word *sanyam* (restraint) is derived from the root 'यमु उपरमे'. We were getting more and more absorbed in material objects; it has now reversed. We are now completely absorbed in the self and this is verily restraint. While practising restraint, the doors of the senses are not closed, but the doors of the inner self are opened. We are not opposed to the world of objects. The senses and sensual pleasure are neither our enemies nor our friends. They have their own identity and characteristic features.

In his book *Sadhak—Badhak*, Jayacharya has written that mentality is both a help and a hindrance When it is guided by attachment it becomes a hindrance. It is because of our weakness that the mind becomes antagonistic to the body Both are different from each other We have to treat them as separate entities and not as the same as we do now Therefore, let us take a vow saying, 'I am different from my body ' The soul is endowed with eternal bliss. There is no joy in mortifying the body. It has come to be commonly said that the more you mortify the body, the more religious you are. I would like to ask you whether religion is connected with suffering or with self-realization. If it is connected with self-realization, a man can be religious whether he suffers or not. And if it is not connected with self-realization—with the power of consciousness—a man cannot be religious, suffering or no suffering. An individual undergoes a month long fast and the first meal he takes after the fast is so meagre that it occupies no more space than the tip of a blade of grass. Again he goes in for a month-long fast. However, if even such an austere person's soul is not morally upright, he continues till eternity to be bound to the cycle of life and death, and is not liberated If mere mortification of the body could ensure liberation, it would have been achieved by many What is needed is a steady practice of spirituality in a natural manner and willingness to endure suffering when it befalls. It will kindle spirituality. Making the senses suffer is not our goal. The goal is to operate them in a spirit of detachment This is the principle of withdrawing the senses from the external objects By practising it we make the senses more introvert than extrovert. Consequently, their receptive limits get changed—only that which is essential is received or registered and the inessential is

abstained from. In this way one is able to draw a clear line between the useful and the useless.

Jainendra : I sense a great danger in this absorption into the self. This feeling of self-love can with the passage of time turn into selfishness. I am not in the least interested in selfish motivation.

Muni Shree : You are using the term self-love to mean something different from absorption into the self. The latter strengthens the urge to attain highest spiritual good. Selfishness is yet another form of attachment. On the other hand, absorption into the self is abandonment of attachment. The source of attachment is passion (कषाय), which comprises anger, pride, deceit, and greed. Passion cannot be given up. In daily speech one does hear, 'I have given up being angry (anger). Ash can cover fire, it cannot extinguish it. Anger is not given up; it manifests itself. It loses all its power once consciousness is awakened Renunciation belongs to the world of vows or strong pledges, and when something has been renounced, it is an indication of fulfilment of the vow. A vow touches the inner being but cannot identify with it If there had been an identity between language and meaning, the mere uttering of 'I am nonviolent' would have rendered the speaker nonviolent Mere articulation of a word does not enact its meaning If it had not been so, mere naming a sweet would have satiated the hunger But it is not the case 'Restraint' and 'regulation' differ in this very respect Regulation is an external compulsion, restraint is the awakening of inner consciousness.

Attachment has a negative force and detachment has a positive force. Positive force is a characteristic of man's nature When it is developed the unnatural negative force is automatically destroyed. Practising the above principle is also very necessary for purifying the senses

3

Purification of the *Pran* and *Apan*

Air has an important role in our body It affects both the body and the mind It also affects physical and mental health. Air has five main types · *Pran* (the vital air which moves in the region of the chest), *Apan* (the vital air which moves in the sphere of the lower abdomen and controls the function of elimination), *Saman* (the vital air whose function is to aid digestion), *Udan* (the vital air dwelling in the thoracic cavity and controlling the intake of air and food), and *Vyan* (the vital air pervading the whole body and circulating the food and breath energy all over the body) Out of these we have to deliberate a little on inhalation and exhalation Air inhaled is *Pran* and that exhaled is *Apan* If we combine the two we call them *Pranapan* Buddhistic literature mentions the term *Anapansati* (आनापानसती) and Jain literature speaks of *Anapan- Nirodh* (आनापाननिरोध)

The centre of *Pran* is the front of the nose As soon as the mind concentrates on it, one goes into the posture of *Mul Bandh* (a *Hath Yoga* exercise) and the *Mul Nadi* (one of the yogic psychic centres) becomes tight This is a clear indication of the combination of the mind and the air inhaled at the front tip of the nose Tightening of the *Mul Nadi* means the end of semen going downwards and the beginning of its going upwards Once I asked a physician about the *Mul Nadi* He said in their medical system there was no such *Nadi* (nerve) which may cause the upward movement of semen I kept thinking on this subject for a long time and wondered how it would be right to speak of an ascetic who remains perpetually chaste in the absence of the upward movement of semen. But now I am in a position to aver that there is a nerve in the body that enables the semen to move upwards and that it is also true that there is a way to become a perpetually chaste ascetic

The origin of semen lies is blood. Blood keeps coursing through the body. When sexual craving is active there is a greater flow of blood in the testicles. There blood is transformed into semen. When semen is

accumulated in full quantity is rouses the sexual desire and is ultimately discharged. Its discharge take place through the exhaled air. If breath is under control, the discharge can be stopped. Stoppage of discharge can mean two things non-formation of semen and assimilation or transformation of formed semen

If inhalation is kept under control, there is a reduced supply of blood to the testicles. The vital element of the blood directly converts itself into power.

In the Science of Yoga two words are current : semen's 'retention' or 'arrest' and its 'attraction' or 'drawing' Retention is semen's discharge arrested just in time and attraction is semen's nourishing right upto the brain by becoming part of blood. Butter permeats milk. Unless separated from the milk it cannot be called butter; in the unseparated state it is just milk, no butter. Similarly, semen is mixed with blood Unless separated from blood, it cannot be called semen, in the unseparated state it is just blood, not semen. Even then semen exists in blood as butter exists in milk. The process of semen's moving upwards is nothing but its not separating from blood and covering itself into vital power. Holding semen through breath control or assimilating it as vital power through will-power is also a process of moving upwards

The human body has seven constituent elements The seventh is semen The subtle form of all the seven constituents is vital power throughout the body. Greater discharge of semen means less vital power and reduced or no discharge means more vital power. Increase in vital power helps develop a strong will, patience, tolerance, keen talent, and many other qualities A major role in their development is played by breath That is why I said that breath is the basis of our strength. The territory of the inhaled air extents from the tip of the nose to the big toe of the foot. Within it the important areas are the tip of the nose, the heart and the navel. According to Acharya Hem Chandra there are two parts of Lord Mahavira's posture. Relaxation of the body in *Paryankasan* (one of the Yogic postures) and fixing the gaze on the tip of the nose

'वपुश्च पर्यंकशयं श्लथं च, दृशौ च नासा नियते स्थिरे च।
न शिक्षितेय परतीर्थनाथैः, जिनेन्द्र! मुद्रापि तवान्यदास्ताम्॥'

One comes to know the sequence of inhalation and exhaltion by concentrating the mind on the nose tip. Thereby breath becomes controlled. And controlling breath means controlling the mind and semen.

There is only one road to victory or control over breath, mind and semen. Victory over mind and semen becomes automatic once breath

has been controlled; likewise victory over mind ensures control of breath and mind. In the science of *Tantra* breath has been called the controller of knowledge :

'इन्द्रियाणां मनो नाथः, मनोनाथस्तु मारुतः ।
मारुतस्य लयो नाथः, स लयो नादमाश्रितः॥'

Let the mind concentrate on the going in and coming out of the vital air and be absorbed into it. Six months of practice will reduce pain and suffering.

There are two methods of fixing the gaze on the navel :

1. Lie down straight and then look at the navel after raising the head
2. Look at the navel while perfoming *Jalandhar Bandh* (a Yogic exercise).

4

Apan and Purity of the Mind

The main region of *apan* is below the navel and at the back right up to its lower end Its function is elimination of faeces, urine, semen, etc Any impurity in them makes one unhappy; when they are pure, one feels happy. Only when the *apan* is impure does one suffer from ailments related to semen and others like warts in the lower region. *Apan* is related to the clean condition of the stomach When the stomach is not clean, constipation occurs and worms develop. A nice way of ensuring cleanness of the stomach is to perform *Ashvini Mudra* (the contraction of the anal sphincter muscles (image of a horse excreting) and to concentrate the mind on the navel

The source of physical strength lies between the navel and anus By scoring a victory against *apan* one can develop the source of strength and energy The secret of the horse's strength is its *Sankoch-Vikoch Mudra* (the same as *Ashvini Mudra* (contracting and lifting the anal muscles). By performing *Ashvini Mudra* a hundred times one can purify the impure anal air *Mulbandh* (a posture where the body from the anus to the neval is contracted and lifted up) is also helpful Holding back from inhaling according to individual capacity after expelling the vital air from the lungs also purifies *Apan*.

Hath Yoga means the meeting of the vital air (*Pran*) and *Apan*. *Ha*—the sun, and *tha*—the moon, when combined become *Hatha*, which means meeting of the sun and the moon Poets of mysticism have mentioned this meeting. It means the meeting of the day and night. This meeting takes place in the navel Through *Mulbandh* (a posture where the body from the anus to the nevel is contracted and lifted up) the breath is carried into the nevel which brings about the meeting of *Pran* and *Apan*, resulting in the end of disequilibrium It is disequilibrium that is physical and mental ailment as well as sinfulness. It is equilibrium that is health and religion It is laid down that a *sadhu* should rest a while after returning from food-begging and before eating it (वीसमेज्ज खणं

मुणी) Fast walking disturbs the equilibrium of the body's constituents. Even nectar taken in that state turns into poison. Pandit Lalan once said to Acharya Shree, 'One of the reasons the *sadhus* fall ill is their going for food-begging. Those who eat as soon as they return from food-begging invite illness. Eating and drinking soon after toiling hard give birth to diseases. Ten to fifteen munites' rest is necessary to bring back the body constituents into equilibrium. One should also not eat when the mind is disturbed. Food taken when the mind is afflicted with anger, lust, greed, etc turns into poison. Disequilibrium or absence of equanimity is not only a spiritual but also a physical and mental defect. Equanimity is not only a spiritual but also a physical and mental virtue. Imbalance between *Pran* and *Apan* means ill health of body and the mind. Balance betwen the two means physical and mental health.'

Purification of the Mind

What is mind? The existence of the continuous flux of the consciousness directed outwards is mind. The existence of language and mind is not uninterrupted as is that of the body. It is a state of flux—Language is linguistic There is no language before speech and there is no language after speech. Language comes into being (exists) only during speech भासिज्जमाणी भासा'. Similarly, mind is contemplative. There is no mind before contemplation and there is no mind after contemplation. Mind exists only during contemplation—'मणिज्जमाणे मणे' Mind changes from moment to moment—'एगेमणं तंसि तंसि समयंसि' Mind is related to the senses. The senses have five sensations. We get to know all objects and their gross forms through the senses The touch of heat and cold enables us to know objects The taste of mango juice enables us to recognize mangoes. The juice is not all that there is to mango. A mango has a shape too, but mere juice leads us to recognize the mango. Smell too brings us in contact with the external world. From and shape are also means of contact. Word also relates us to the external world. The mind does not have a direct contact with the external world. It establishes it through the senses.

What is the difference between intellect and mind ? Both are harmonious forms of the same consciousness. There is only one sun but its light gets fragmented and is received through many separate doors and window Different entries give it different forms. The same rain water takes on different forms. ponds, pots, and the sea. Jayacharya has

written : One of the watchposts got covered with sand. When the site was dug at one spot, one corner of the post was revealed. When dug on the other side, the second corner was revealed. The four corners when dug became four different objects. When the digging was complete a single watchpost was revealed. Similarly, our consciousnes assumes different forms, as it is progressively uncovered. Intelligence, senses and the mind are harmonious forms of the same consciousness.

Really speaking, purity of mind consists only in such a harmonious state. सामयिक or attaining equanimity or fusion with the true self also means the same thing. A sadhu's life is also a kind of fusion with the true self, but it too requires a specially dedicated practice of equanimity Therefore, Upadhyaya Yashovijayaji has said, 'अनुत्तरं साम्यमुपेति योगी'— Yogis experience a special type of equanimity.

Disequilibrum is caused by many factors : honour, dishonour, obedience, discipline, etc. So long as these criteria prevail, a father will feel angry if his son does not obey his order because it hurts the father's sense of honour A husband loses his peace of mind if his wife disobeys him. Therefore, equanimity of mind is not possible so long as these criteria continue to be followed

The very character of creation is dualistic. Profit and loss, happiness and unhappiness, honour and dishonour, life and death and many other opposites are before us. That is why in *Yoga* we are advised to face them with equanimity. Feeling happy at profit and unhappy at loss is a sign of lack of equanimity Equanimity is spiritual bliss. But it does not imply that equanimity makes a man inactive. Equanimity is in fact a sign of spiritual valour (whereby man is moved to attain the objects of his life). Freedom from mundane concerns implies turning of the mind inwards. Because any object that has existence is capable of activity. In the language of *Nyayashastra* existence is defined as 'अर्थक्रियाकारित्वं हि सत्. For an object to exist means to be capable of purposive activity. Therefore, existence cannot be imagined without activity. In Jain philosophy matter has been regarded as 'उत्पाद-व्यय-ध्रौव्यात्मक' (invariably possessed of the attributes of beginning, end, and fixedness). Therefore, matter cannot exist without purposive activity. That which lacks the above three attributes is non-matter, like flower in the sky. Therefore, if the soul is something that exists, it can never be inactive.

In reality religion is not an acquired but a natural quality of the soul. It is born.He who understands this truth becomes the master of all the three worlds (this world, the other world and the nether world).

It is common belief that the mind is unsteady or fickle. It gets perplexed, gets filled with dirty things. But it should be remembered that perplexity arises only in a state of disharmony between and among the mind, senses and the air. As soon as their equilibrium is restored, perplexity automatically disappears. The means of establishing harmony or equilibrium is rhythmic breath The quantity of air inhaled sucessively should be the same in order to have rhythmic breathing. Complete identification with harmonious rhythm and tone also develops strength

One way of purifying the mind also consists in fixing the gaze on the nervous system If one lies down and concentrates on the hig toe of the right foot, the mind becomes calm. In fact the nervous structure is very complex. He who comes to understand it can do big things. I know a few people who, even though not possessed of any specialized knowledge, cure stomachache etc., by a mere jerk because they have acquired some secret of the nerves.

Looking fixedly at the sky also helps. Because the sky is infinite, seeing it mean seeing the infiniteness of our souls as a result of which we get lost in ourselves. That is why many Yogis meditate also by concentrating their eyes on the sky

On having purified the mind, we can also enter into telepathic communication by concentrating on a single thought.

5

Elimination of Nervous Tension

Relaxation is yet another term used for elimination of nervous tension. It is needed when the body is tense. Therefore, for being relaxed, it is necessary to know what tension is and how it is produced.

These days 'tension' has become a very popular word, because mental tension is increasing in proportion to the increase in industrialization. In the last rainy season the Vice-Minister in the Japanese embassy came to meet Acharya Shree Acharya Shree asked him. 'Do you also practise relaxation (कायोत्सर्ग) sometimes ? He informed Acharya Shree that the technique of relaxation (कायोत्सर्ग) was widely popular in his country. Similarly, specialists from Germany and America also informed him that it would be difficult for people to survive in their countries without practising relaxation. In fact, so far as Japan is concerned, it is compulsory for most students passing out of Japanese universities to undergo a six-month training in relaxation in some selected places Only after completing it do they enter life. This is why the Japanese are very hardworking. They told Acharya Shree that Indians speak much but do little. Its only reason is that they do not practise कायोत्सर्ग or relaxation That is why they lack discipline too.

It is true that toiling hard increases tension. It is equally true that physical labour does not create as much tension as do mental problems. The main causes of mental tension are fear, hatred, anger, deceit, etc.

Fear

Fear gives rise to unnatural states Really, the effects of fear are unimaginable. Psychologists too have shed a good deal of light on this theme. Many studies have been made on this subject. Both Ayurvedic and Homoeopathic systems have minutely investigated it According to them fear stiffens the body. This puts artificial pressure on the nerves and they cease to function Of course, we are all too familiar with the

plight of our body under fear. There is a general feeling of shrinking. In fact, there are occasions when sudden fear results in heart failure The scriptures list fear also among seven causes of untimely death. Scientists too confirm it

Hatred

In Hindi hatred is pictured as turning up the nose and knitting the brows. It indicates how tension grows automatically in the body with the entertainmnt of hatred. It in turn affects blood circulation and brings about weakness

Anger

It is an established fact that an angry man is always tense. As a result he is not able to do anything with a free mind. When scientists injected angry man's blood into mice, they started strange movements so much so that some of them even died, because in anger toxins get mixed with blood. It too has been seen that in rare cases infants have died while being suckled by angry mothers

We heard about an incident in Rajasthan. In a village lived a man of very calm temperament Ordinarily he never felt angry. But one day a teacher beat up his son When he came to know of it he felt so angry that in that very agitated state of mind he set out to go to the school He had hardly walked some distance when he had a heart attack and died a few days thereafter

Deceit

It feels very pleasant to deceive others Not only this, the man who can skilfully cheat others is regarded very clever But it increases mental tension very much. When we cheat someone, it indicates our extreme attachment to the thing for which we have cheated. Intense attachment causes tension in the mind Let us take a lover as an example A lover sees every moment the person he is deeply attached to; not only this, he loses his appetite and sleep too. It gives birth to many illnesses.

Through their investigations doctors have found out that 60% diseases are caused by mental tensions. About ten to twenty per cent diseases are physical. Some diseases are caused by bacteria also. Here also disease occurs because of the weakening of the body's power to fight disease. But all this is the outcome of mental problems. This is the reason why external diseases can also affect us only when we are

mentally unsound.

From the materialistic point of view America is a very affluent country. But the number of diseases in America is very large. It is said that some forty-five per cent people there have psychiatric problems. So far as India is concerned, she is quite backward in material terms, but here the percentage of people suffering from psychiatric problems is only fifteen. The obvious reason is that there is less mental tension here. Mental conflicts grow with increasing urbanization. It is much less so in villages. Even though the standard of living in the villages is lower, people there remain more healthy because they have fewer mental tensions.

There ae many more causes of mental tension But true accomplishment lies in countering them. The main means of doing so is *Kayotsarga* or relaxation. Mental conflicts cannot disappear without making the mind straight and simple Therefore, strengthening the mind is the first step to getting rid of mental tension. It is this that can be rephrased as *Granthi Moksha* (deliverance from all knots and complexes).

There are three processes of relaxation—on the lying position, in the sitting position and in the standing position Of these the one done lying is the easiest. One should first of all lie down straight with closed eyes. Then raising the hands and inhaling maximally the body should be made very tense Thereafter one should return to the original position while exhaling slowly. It is repeated several times. It smoothens the process of blood circulation and the carbon is expelled. Finally stretching hands and feet according to one's convenience the body should be relaxed In this state breathing becomes quite slow and effortless. This constitutes the first activity.

After it the mental activity starts. Closing the eyes the sight is fixed successively on the eyes, nose, throat or neck, hands, chest, stomach, thighs, groins, legs, feet and toes While the mind is being concentrated on each, one should go on thinking that each of those organs is becoming relaxed. While concentrating on the toes, one should keep thinking that the whole tension is getting out of them This constitutes the second activity.

Thereafter begins the orderly relaxation of the muscles. Right from the bottom to the top the sight is concentrated on the muscles and the suggestion is passed on to each that it is becoming relaxed. This constitutes the third activity.

The fourth activity is the elimination of attachment. So long as

there is the slightest attachment to the body, so long as there is some mental conflict, *Kayotsarga* or relaxation cannot be fully accomplished. When an individual forgets his own existence, he can be sure he has accomplished relaxation.

Jainendra : Man cannot become absorbed in the self so long as he thinks, 'I am (Aham-Asmi).' Therefore, he can liberate himself from egotism only if he thinks, 'He is.' 'He' symbolizes the whole truth, while 'I' symbolizes fragmented knowledge. That is why that process alone is Kayotsarg or relaxation in which the 'I' is elimínted. Some devotees get so lost in religious singing that they forget themselves Whatever they say in that state becomes so full of feeling that it has an unfailing effect on others. Telepathy is the outcome only of this kind of total absorpation in the self. When the 'I' gets fused with and dissolved into 'He', thoughts automatically become transcendent in that state of concentration. Even national boundaries pose no obstacle to them then.

Muni Shree · It can be termed *Laya Yoga* (लययोग). There are many kinds of *Yoga—Jap Yoga* (जपयोग), *Laya Yoga* (लययोग), *Dhyan Yoga* (ध्यानयोग), etc. But the final test of all kinds of *Yoga* is the fusion of the soul, senses and the mind. To be a disciple also implies that he should become one with the teacher (*guru*). If the disciple does not become one with the teacher, he may perhaps gain intellectually, but will not gain spiritually. In ancient times *Acharyas* did very little teaching; mostly they made them (disciples) do their *gurus*' work. In fact any disciple who identified himself with the *guru* kept himself fully absorbed serving the *guru* throughout the day His soul was awakened whenever the *guru* parted with some knowledge. Intellectual achievement is a mere triviality as compared with spiritual awakening. Really speaking, a person always remains restless and anxious if he does not fuse himself with others.

The entire preceding deliberation brings us to a point where the body and the soul become undifferentiated. In my opinion it is possible to develop a highly effective method of keeping the body healthy through spiritual procedures. If this spiritual treatment is practised in the *Sadhana Kendra*, it will certainly be a new therapy. It can prove more efficacious than even psychiatry. Naturopathy is of course receiving wide attention these days, but there are a few physicians in America who cure diseases merely by the breathing process.

6

Emancipation from Knots

(ग्रन्थि-मोक्ष)

We are not unfamiliar with knots. We see them in ropes, trees, and in the body. Just as knots can be dissolved in material substances, in the same way they are dissolved in the mind also. Mental knots are more complex than external knots. The mental knots have the following causes :

1. Perverted belief
2. Mental desire
3. Crookedness

Perverted belief

It is the main cause of being assailed by knots. The more perverted our beliefs are, the greater the number of mental knots. Because of them we relinquish the real and accept the unreal. Sometimes we are attacked by doubts and at other times by confusion. If we doubt someone, a feeling of opposition grows and we automatically begin treating him as an antagonist. Once upon a time, Queen Chelana of King Shrenik was sleeping. One of her hands remained uncovered by the quilt and got chilled When she woke up, she uttered, 'What should he be doing ?' The king happened to hear it and got suspicious of her character. Surely, he thought, there was another man in her life. As soon as the night was over, he ordered Abhaya Kumar to set the queen's palace on fire. Behind this act was the king's doubt or suspicion. In fact the queen had automatically expressed concern for a monk engaged in meditation in the open whom she had seen only a day earlier

Who is there who does not behave like the king under suspicion ? A deer runs after a mirage. Similarly, we work with a mind in disarray. We mistake the ephemeral for the eternal, non-self for self, and unhappiness for happiness Both the affluent sections of society and the

ruling class of today are on this track these days. Is state power being used in a desirable manner ? Is it desirable to accumulate so much wealth ? All this is happening because of a perverse outlook

Mental desire

Every man has to meet the basic needs of life. However, human desire exceeds them. Drinking milk leaves a nice taste, But once it turns into a desire, it becomes bondage. One does not develop a passion for milk by drinking it once. But one who takes it daily feels its want even if he does not get it for a day. This typifies a situation where milk is not merely a need but a desire Its daily intake becomes such a hardened habit that need turns into desire.

Nobody is totally free from desire, but there is an ascending order in it Desire has an ascending order just as there is an ascending order in drawing a line on water, on sand or soil and on stone. A desire akin to a line on water is mere necessity, one akin to a line on sand shows increased desire; but the one akin to that on stone denotes that need has become secondary and desire has become endless Satisfaction does not accrue as a result of trying to remove dissatisfaction. One the countrary, dissatisfaction grows and one case of dissatisfaction leads to another. In logic it is called *Anavastha* (अनवस्था) (non-finality of propositions or endlessness of statements). To keep one piece of cloth clean we put a cover on it, to keep the latter clean, we put another and a third, fourth, fifth cover and so on *ad infinitum*. Dissatisfaction knows no end. This exactly is the form of *Anavastha*.

Crookedness

Crookedness is the first step to being infected by knots. Deceit means suffering from knots; rectitude means liberation from knots. Straight behaviour has no mental entanglement at any stage—past, present or future, so it affords no opportunity for suffering from knots. Crooked behaviour has mental entanglement at all stages—past, present and future. Therefore it breeds knots.

There are three methods of liberating oneself from knots : (a) self-analysis ([illegible]) (b) auto-suggestion ([illegible]) and (c) putting aside or away ([illegible])

Self-analysis

Self-analysis is a psychological method. In [illegible] language it is

atonement. When something undesirable happens, it creates mental conflict which in turn creates knots in the mind. Self-analysis or atonement disentangles them.

Auto-suggestion

It means to give suggestions to oneself. This is one of Indian Yoga's processes. It brings about changes in the nature of the mind It breaks the mental knots. A lot of good results from giving suggestions to oneself with complete faith while inhaling the air Similarly giving suggestions while going to sleep also yields early benefits. Suggestions made in this manner reach every part of the body by way of blood circulation within three minutes It is necessary to breathe deeply. Auto-suggestion can even cure conspirational feelings

Putting Aside (*Nirasan*)

It is a process of dissociation of *Karmas*. Autosuggestion disentangles the knots while *Nirasan* breaks them. Consciousness becomes so powerful in *Nirasan* that mental fickleness beats a retreat and the knots give way. In it there is insistence on truth. Lord Buddha said in the same language of insistence .

इहासने शुष्यतु मे शरीरं, त्वगस्थिमांसं प्रलयं च यातु।
अप्राप्य बोधिं बहुकालदुर्लभां, नैवासनात्कायमिदं चलिष्यति॥

Insistence on truth cannot but undo the knots. All great men in history took a vow of insistence on truth. They made their determination to insist on truth so strong that success and accomplishment became easy and physical urges disappeared. With such strong insistence knots can be easily undone. The method of *Nirasan* is nothing but the method of penance. It is characterized by prohibition, denial and renunciation. It removes spiritual indifference. Self-analysis or *Atma Vishleshan* resolves the knot, autosuggestion or *Nirdeshan* opens the knot, and dissociation of *Karmas* or *Nirasan* breaks the knot.

The result of emancipation from knots is a straight and simple life. Crookedness and simplicity are two aspects of life. The former creates problems in life. There are not many real problems in our lives; man is himself responsible for bringing them into being. According to some people the times and governments are such that problems are bound to increase. Problems may be present outside but they need not plague you. They trouble you only when you internalize them. It is only when the mind is weak that external things can enter it. A strong mind is immune

to external influences. By keeping a window closed we can stop the entry of the chill prevailing outside, because our defences are strong. The same applies to external circumstances. A fickle mind is immediately affected by external circumstances.

Three people react differently to an unagreeable talk. One hears it but pays no heed to it; the second takes it ill and does something; the third taking it as unjust thinks of retaliation. For him it becomes a dangerous event. The event is the same but it is variously experienced. The degree of the mind's fickleness determines the degree of being influenced by external circumstances. Mental peace is disturbed not by the event as such, but by the fickleness or unsteadiness of the mind. To preserve mental peace it is necessary to analyse the event and its effect.

Jainendra . Peace should not be the peace of the grave. Inert peace blunts consciousness

Muni Shree : I am not talking of the artificial peace which plays hide and seek with circumstances. Resistance to injustice is not being identified by me as disturbance of peace. I am talking of that peace which has preserved the strength to resist, that cannot be challenged by retrogression, which no retrogressive power can counteract and deflect. The mind once steadied gives up the undesirable like a sieve rejecting the unwanted stuff. Once crookedness has spent itself up what remains is sincerity and straighiness. Emancipation from knots then comes automatically

7

Development of Will-Power

Our body has two centres : *Gyan Kendra* or centre of Cognition and *Kriya Kendra* or Centre of Activity There are two nerve-networks—sensory and motor. Sensory nerves are connected with the *Gyan Kendra* and motor nerves are connected with the *Kriya Kendra*. Psychology speaks of three aspects of human disposition Cognitive aspect, sensation aspect and action aspect. There would have been no hiatus between cognition and action if man had not been bestowed with sensations When the stomach is disturbed reason dictates that one should drink butter milk instead of milk. This is a rational turn or change. But faith has primacy over reason. The function of Will-Power is to transform knowledge into faith.

Sankalpa, *Japa* and *Bhavana*

These are three different words. Patanjali used the second, the Jain literature uses the third, and in modern literature the first is more popular The intended meanings of the three words are not at all different· *Japa* means to be animated or inspired by तदर्थ—in this case to be animated or inspired by that which is reverentially repeated to the extent that the repeater and the repeated almost become one.

In Ayurveda, the *Lavan Bhaskar* powder is animated (inspired) by lemon. *Amalki Rasayan* is animated by its own juice or essence, which means that embric myrobalm is levigated in its own juice. Even where certain substances are not different, they develop different characteristics as a result of the process of animation. The animating substance becomes dominant in the resultant substance. *Panchputi* mica (mica substances to a particular method of prepairing drugs—various substances being generally wrapped up in leaves, covered with clay and heated in fire) is very different in its qualities from *Ek hazarpati* mica (*Panch* means 'five' and *Ek hazar* means 'a thousand'). Many people

make resolutions but do not subject it to 'levigation' (reinforcement). Mere two or four repetitions of the resolution do not yield the desired result. It takes long to 'levigate' effectively. The longer it is done the greater the animation. A substance gets primarily imbued with the properties of the animating substance. If the latter is lemon, its properties will dominate, and if it is pomegranate, its properties will dominate.

The same process applies to the human mind. It too shall develop or imbibe the enduring effects of the feeling it is animated by. This accounts for differences of faith Resolution plays an important part in building of faith.

In the science of Intoning Sacred Formulas (मंत्र-शास्त्र) two resolutioins play an important role. Seven kinds of purification (शुद्धि) are required for resolution :

1. **Dravya Shuddhi** (द्रव्य-शुद्धि) : The inner being of man should be free from anger, arrogance and jealousy, and should be straight and simple.

2. **Kshetra Shuddhi** (क्षेत्रशुद्धि) : The place should be peaceful and clean

3. **Samaya Shuddhi** (समयशुद्धि) · Three times recitation of select Vedic hymns—morning, noon, and evening.

4 **Asan Shuddhi** (आसनशुद्धि) . Sitting either on the bare floor, or on a wooden structure of planks or on a woollen blanket

5. **Vinaya Shuddhi** (विनयशुद्धि) Pause at the right place while making an utterance.

6. **Manah Shuddhi** (मनःशुद्धि) . Purity of mind.

7. **Vachan Shuddhi** (वचनशुद्धि) : Purity of speech.

Resolution has three types : *Vachik* (वाचिक), *Upanshu* (उपांशु), and *Manasik* (मानसिक).

Vachik : That which is done verbally.

Upanshu : Silent speech or speech with lip movements but without articulation.

Manasik . Not even lip movement, only contemplation. We should silently repeat the names of only those who are our ideals. It builds faith. When we silently and reverentially repeat the name of a pure soul, our mind gets imbued with its quality. Every sound affects the body. Different sounds have effect on different diseases. It was only on this basis that therapy through sound started. Sound creates vibrations in the atmosphere and also produces the idea which bursts

out or flashes (explodes) on the mind when a meaningful sound is uttered. It is no less effective than an atomic explosion.

Our resolution should be positive—instead of 'I shall not be angry' it should be 'My love is increasing.' The positive proves more beneficial than the negative Negativeness is automatically dissolved in the positiveness of a resolution.

It is mentioned in the *Bhagavati Sutra* that Lord Mahavira was once asked, 'Lord ! Is food cooked in fire botanical or metallic ?' The answer was, 'Metallic ' It has been animated by metal, therefore the food that was botanical has become metallic This is identity or oneness In it the earlier state gets dissolved into the later stage.

To retain a resolution for a long period is a sign of its success. For establishing identity or oneness a short period is not enough.

The resolve, 'I am pure' should be held at least for fifty minutes and that too with such a feeling of identification that the thinker and the thought become inseparable It is this intensity of identity which bears fruit. It is called *Samrasibhava* (समरसीभाव) by Jain Acharyas and Samapatti (समापत्ति) by Patanjali. The essence of resolution does not lie in its articulation but in the identity of the person resolving and the resolution.

Jainendra I sense some danger in the resolutions we are being made to make during the morning prayers.

Muni Shree : What is the danger ?

Jainendra I believe that no liberation is possible without getting riddance from the ego

Muni Shree : Why do you treat the ego as bondage ? It also denotes existence

Jainendra I am talking about the ego which indicates vanity I prefer 'The soul exists' to 'I am soul '

Muni Shree : The resolution, 'I am soul' denotes the primacy of existence not of vanity By identifying with the soul a man gets disembodied and turns into soul.

8

Mental Concentration

Of the eight aphorisms meant for practising the accomplishment of austerity by individuals why was concentration of the mind put at number eight ? It should have been the first The above question is quite natural But in my view the first seven aphorisms are preliminary background to the concentration of the mind. If they are successfully accomplished, it becomes easier to accomplish mental concentration In the beginning it is difficult to prevent the fickleness of the mind

There are three obstacles to concentration : memory, imagination, and current incident

Memory Past events come to the fore when they find an occasion to do so Seeing the site of a village visited twenty years ago, old memories are revived—this is *Daishik-Smriti* (place-related memory). With the onset of the summer memories of earlier summers are awakened. It is *Kalik-Smriti* (time-related memory). As soon as the external world and the individual unite, memory is awakened and the mind gets entangled in it.

Imagination · If memory represents an obstacle from the past, imagination represents an obstacle arising out of the future The mind is busy weaving dreams of what one would do, write, get money from etc, Imagination is not a present reality. Both memories of the past and imagination of the future keep agitating the mind.

Current Incident : Even a current incident agitates the mind. The mind becomes agitated as soon as it relates itself to external objects. Deliverance from all the three obstacles is necessary if we want our mind not to be agitated or to be less agitated. And the way to do it is concentration. Extricating oneself from all the three and relating consciousness to the soul is concentration of mind. An old definition of concentration is :

[illegible] ।

Concentration is that flow of consciousness which does not even

touch anything outside consciousness In it there is a perpetual contact with the 'self' and no contact with the 'other' Therefore, it can be said to be the offspring of consciousness

To be self-absorbed is concentration The soul is 'self' (स्व) and all the rest is 'other' (पर) Having become free from attachment to the 'other', directing the thoughts on pure soul and identifying with it is self-realization And the realization or knowledge is invariable on the axis of time, and since its perpetuity is inviolable, it is the offspring of consciousness It is comparable to a lamp's flame—every moment's flame gives place to the next moment's flame and, thus, the past and the present get fused The flow of thought when it follows the same pattern as that of the flame becomes concentration

The chief subject of contemplation is the pure form of the Supreme Spirit The externally oriented consciousness has to be turned inwards and made one with the soul

Jainendra How is unity possible in a situation where the duality of the contemplator and the contemplated is not there ? What kind of a state is it where the soul gets united with the soul or becomes one with the soul

Muni Shree : The soul uniting with the soul is a dualistic state That which unites is the external state, that with which it is united is the internal state

Jainendra : I sense danger in concentration It has to eschew the danger of self-love A little concentration beneficial for health and useful for rendering service to others, which is called self-gratification (आत्म-रमण) is all right, but there is a difference in self-gratification and self-love (स्व-रति) Self-gratification (आत्म-रमण) has a wider import Self-love is in vogue in psychology also and has a narrow import The devotee and the Lord are two separate beings Then shall the devotee create daulity of self in his own devotion and unite them later ?

Muni Shree : Duality and unity are similar processes At one place there is unity of God and the devotee, and at another there is unity of two states of soul If a support is needed, it is available in both cases

Jaineandra One who gets 'fixed' in the self itself becomes in course of time not only useless but distracted He becomes unaware of circumstances

Muni Shree : It is not a question of being 'fixed' in the self in relation to circumstances, Faith is one s self (स्व-निष्ठा) means consciousness or awakening and wisdom, wisdom which is nothing but awakening The contemplator and the contemplated remain separate

during the period of practising spiritual accomplishment Once spiritual accomplishment is there, the two become one

Jainendra . It is not in the nature of consciousness to contract and limit itself Consciousness does not return inwards from outside, it become colossal after having spread outside

Muni Shree : Consciousness getting inwards does not imply its contraction but its extension You are using the language of territorial extension and I am using that of power extension. In territorial terms the size is also colossal The colossal nature of consciousness is of a very exceptional kind

Jainendra You say, 'Put an end to imagination,' whereas I say, 'Free imagination of all restraints'

Muni Shree At certain levels of practising spiritual accomplishment your language may be acceptable However, levels differ from person to person

Jainendra Greater disintegration has taken place among those trying to get rid of imagination, according to my experience

Muni Shree : 'Union' (योग) is a proper word Earlier you used the word 'extricating' (विच्छिन्न) If it is union I am prepared to accept it

Muni Shree : So far as I am concerned, earlier also I said 'contact with the self' and no contact with the other ' The former is union I did not speak only of separating or extricating

Mohan (to Jainendra) : One can understand the language which demands progressive renunciation, but it is difficult to understand the language which demands progressive extension. What does it mean in practice ?

Jainendra If you have reverential faith in Acharya Tulsi, it is easy to become one with him But it is difficult to understand how Jainendra should become one with Jainendra To unite with others is extension and it is easy too

Muni Shree : Being one with oneself and being one with someone else is a linguistic difference Language is not truth, Truth is to be sought in truth

Jainendra . Religion turns into irreligion if one practises accomplishment of the self in place of accomplishment of the soul

Muni Shree : The same word has two forms if 'self' implies egoism it can be irreligion, but how can it be termed irreligion if it implies existence ?

The Process of Disengaging from Sensual Pleasure

The process of establishing identity with the object of contemplation is *Pratyahara* (withdrawal of mind from external objects). To achieve it there is a posture (मुद्रा) called *Sarvendriyoparam* (सर्वेन्द्रियोपरम). It gives mental peace To remain in this posture for two to four minutes is to neutralize one-hour long physical labour It concentrates the mind whatever the degree of its distraction.

The Process of Disengaging from Perversions

There are four types of meditation *Pindasth* (पिण्डस्थ), *Padasth* (पदस्थ), *Roopasth* (रूपस्थ), *Roopatit* (रूपातीत) For concentration some support is necessary, be it God, individual soul or an external object In *Pindasth* the support is one's body By concentrating on one of the sixteen spots like the tip of the nose one gets peace of mind

Jainendra : There is a danger of becoming inactive or inflating the ego in meditation

Muni Shree One experiences innate joy during meditation I look within myself I spend some time on meditation Even then my activeness has not diminished, nor am I assailed by egotism On the other hand, I keep experiencing joy Therefore, I feel that there is no danger in meditation. In the absence of joy the process of meditation can have something wrong in it

Jainendra I have known at least a dozen people engaging in meditation upto two hours yet I find that their minds are distracted

Muni Shree Something may have gone wrong with the process. Otherwise meditation results only in joy not in distraction.

Achraya Rajneesh came to Rajsamand. The topic of meditation cropped up for discussion He emphasised concentration without any external support. I said it was an advanced stage, in the beginning difficulties arise in the absence of support Using the navel as the support is extremely helpful in concentration. The very source of the breath pulsation is brought under control It becomes rhythmical and the mind becomes steady. Eyebrows, the tip of the nose, throat, the heart, the navel, the middle part and the big toe of the foot are centres of consciousness Concentrating the mind on these centres is called *Pindasth* meditation During *Padasth* meditation support of words is sought One should choose one's adored word as support, like God or someone else During *Roopasth* meditation one meditates on a concrete object other than oneself. It is because of this type of meditation that

idols came into being There is the story of Eklavya, who wanted to become proficient in the martial arts For him the best support was Dronacharya He got deeply involved in learning the arts after making Dronacharya's idol as his support

Roopatit meditation is meditating upon the Supreme Being It frees one from perversions It is the process of abandoning perversions. The Gita says

'विषया विनिवर्तन्ते, निराहारस्य देहिनः।
रसवर्ज रसोप्यस्य, परं दृष्ट्वा निवर्तते॥'

(Sence-objects cease for him, who does not enjoy them with his senses; but the taste for them persists This relish also disappears in the case of the man of stable mind when he sees the Supreme Being).

Sensual pleasures and perversions are two different things The former are outside, the latter are inside In Jainology the word *Rus* means perversion There are 23 sensual pleasures and 244 perversions. By closing the eyes one does not derive sensual pleasure but one does not get rid of perversion It is destroyed only when one comes to know the *Param*, i e , the Supreme Being. He is without sensual pleasure, without perversion, He is the goal He is what you want to be. By knowing that Supreme Being one frees oneself from perversions. During meditation liberation is achieved from both sensual pleasures and perversions

Jainendra Is liberation a state of non-existence ?

Muni Shree : No, it is a state of existence. In it while finite pleasures are got rid of, infinite joy is achieved Supreme bliss is infinite, firm or steady and indestroyable or endless Worldly pleasures are ephemeral A man is not so foolish as to abandon existence and go into non-existence Mocking at the non-existential concept of liberation of the Vaisheshik School of Philosophy some Acharya of the Nyaya School of Philosophy has written :

'वरं वृन्दावने रम्ये, क्रोष्ट्रत्वमभिवांछितम्।
न तु वैशेषिकीं मुक्ति, गौतमो गन्तुमिच्छति॥'

(Gautam would prefer the presence of a jackal in Vrindavan to accepting the liberation propounded by the *Vaisheshik*.)

Liberation is at once a state of existence as well as non-existence

'अतएवान्यशून्योपि, नात्मा शून्यः स्वरूपतः।
शून्याशून्यस्वभावोयमात्मनैवोपलभ्यते ॥'

We want limitless knowledge, limitless joy, limitless purity and limitless power. In the absence of the above, there can be no religion

These are our four goals. Irrespective of how much one achieves, the goals remain what they are. Such a state cannot be called non-existential; it is a developed state of consciousness. What we do not want is a finite state. Its existence ends there; therefore, it is a state in which both existence and non-existence inhere.

Jainendra · Some of the leaders of the Sarvodaya movement are getting inclined towards V.K Krishnamurti. One day Dada Dharamadhikari took me also to him. He sounds extremely correct. He speaks with complete confidence. But what is said is not practised. He says that time does not exist but his weekly programme of activities is drawn in advance

Muni Sukh : So far as freedom from passion (वीतरागता) is concerned, that of the *Tirthankar* (founder of a religion) and the *Kevali* (the omniscient) is equal. A *Tirthankar* is busy with the creation of a religious doctrine, but this is not the case with *Kevali* Can it then be said that the completion of freedom from passion lies in creation ?

Muni Shree : Creation comes out of the process of experiencing but its form depends on one's competence and background. For both (*Tirthankar* and *Kevali*) the behaviour and activity of the body are essential. This essentialness will continue so long as the body exists.

Muni Sukh : Is there a logical sequence in *Pindasth, Padasth* and other types of meditation ?

Muni Shree : No thought was ever given to this point but, if necessary, it can be investigated

At this point Umaro Chandji Mehta interrupted The body approaches the soul through the steadiness of speech and mind. It is the soul which is beyond form The first three types of meditation are instrumental in achieving stability or steadiness of the body, speech and mind.

Muni Shree : There is a different sequence in some works, but the sequence presented above is sensible *Pind* (the body), *Pad* (speech), and *Roop* constitute a proper sequence.

1

Right Behaviour

Sat (सत्) has two meanings. The first is 'true' or 'existent' and the second is 'right' or 'good'. Both meanings are in vogue Here both of them are acceptable Right behaviour (सत्-व्यवहार) is that which one would practise towards oneself or towards one's kith and kin (आत्मीय-व्यवहार) or good and courteous behaviour (सौजन्यपूर्ण-व्यवहार). The first is undoubtedly primary, but the second has also been given a lot of importance Acharya Somprabh has written .

वरं विभववन्ध्यता सुजनभावभाजां नृणा-
मसाधुचरितार्जिता न पुनरूर्जिताः सम्पदः।
कृशत्वमपि शोभते सहजमायतौ सुन्दर,
विपाकविरसा न तु श्वयथुसंभवा स्थूलता।

Goodness and courtsey are desirable, even though one may gain nothing else If the gains come as a result of being bad and discourteous, they are like plumpness caused by oedema or inflammation Being lean is far better than acquiring such plumpness In such cases plumpness denotes disease and leanness health

What is the criterion of false or bad behaviour so that we may judge which behaviour is true and good and which is false and bad There are three criteria of false or bad behaviour : cruelty, hypocrisy and indifference Likewise, true or good behaviour also has three criteria : gentleness, friendliness and sympathy

Cruelty

No behaviour can be true and good if it is motivated by cruelty. Many religious people say why they should bother about behaviour. But according to me it is not possible to be nonviolent and spiritual internally while the behaviour is cruel. A religious person can never

behave cruelly Therefore, for the behaviour to be true and good it is essential that it be gentle

Jainendra Is it ever possible for intolerance to be a part of right and good behaviour ?

Muni Shree : Yes, it can

Jainendra Intolerance is bound to breed hard-heartedness

Muni Shree : The potter beats the pitcher but below the pot he supports the clay with his hand Gentle behaviour has room for it.

Jainendra Close affinity or the feeling of oneness can be a criterion of true and good behaviour But how can gentleness be one of its criteria ?

Muni Shree : I set forth gentleness to counter cruelty, not to counter hard-heartedness Hard-heartedness is different from cruelty A mother towards her son and a teacher towards his disciple may have to be hard-hearted but neither can be cruel

Lord Mahavira laid down many vows forbidding cruel behaviour Forbidding *Vrittichchheda* (वृत्तिच्छेद) or stopping financial support, *Bandh* (बन्ध) or keeping in bondage, *Angachchheda* (अगच्छेद), or multilating parts of the body and *Atibhar* (अतिभार) or overloading, etc , can be called either nonviolence or prohibition of cruel behaviour How can religion survive in the face of cruelty ? Food can protect as well as kill life But both functions cannot be performed at the same time Likewise, religion and cruelty cannot coexist One should not expect religion where there is cruelty One of the formulas of gentleness of behaviour is *Ichchhakar* (इच्छाकार) It is a common observance (समाचारी) of Jain monks It means, Do it if you want ' The *gurus* also practise *Ichchhakar* generally The natural question is How can an organization function following the above practice ?' Under special circumstances giving orders and enforcing them is permitted. Normally it is to be thought that the existence of another person is as important as mine Both are relative to each other My expectations are there, so are those of the other Society is based on the principle that I contribute to meeting his expectations and so does the other to meeting mine

In ancient times slaves were bought After being bought they were the property of the buyer They could even be punished with death by the latter It was for this reason that slavery has been regarded as a contemptible institution and it has been abolished

Hypocrisy

According to some people being simple and straight in these days is not useful On the other hand, I consider straightforwardness is an eternal verity It is always useful One can have no peace of mind without it Those regarding it useless forget that straightforwardness is not the same as foolishness Being simple does not mean being a simpleton Some words have become ossified and they need to be changed

Jainendra Popularly the word *Sadachar* (सदाचार) meaning 'good conduct' is used But *Samachar* (समाचार) meaning 'observance' is not adequate It should be *Satyachar* (truthful conduct). Good conduct is a socially accepted topical policy If religious conduct too was confined to it, the much-needed revolution will not come from religion. Therefore, religion should go deeper than that Words like peace, tolerance have also become similarly fossilized

Muni Shree : In the word *Sadachar* is included *sat*, which also denotes truth' *Sat* and *Satya* are the same With changing times it came to include another denotation also *Sadachar* did not remain merely *Satyachar* (truthful conduct) but also came to mean 'good conduct Linguistically speaking words keep degenerating and rejuvenating.

Jainendra *Satyachar* (truthful conduct) will manifest itself in a manner different from the present day *Sadachar* (good conduct)

Muni Shree : It is true The connotation can change if *Sadachar* is changed and another word substituted

Jainendra 'Reaction' and 'Escape' are two words widely prevalent in literature I am called an escapist I wonder who would not try to escape in the face of a bull

Muni Shree : Every word has the same plight. No word is free from rejuvenation, degeneration, rise, decline Two to two and a half thousand years ago the word *Pashand* denoted an ascetic It has been used honourably in the stone inscriptions of Ashok and in Jain and Buddhist literature Today, it has acquired a despicable denotation It sounds unpleasant.

Jainendra The word *Asur* (असुर) is a hated one for us but in Iran or Persia it is used for a god.

Muni Shree : In ancient literature *Asur* meant a god. Even *Yaksha* denoted importance. Today, it is different. Today *Sahasik* (साहसिक) is praiseworthy. When it was first used it meant *Avimrishyakari*

(अविमृश्यकारी), i.e., one who acted unthinkingly. The degenerate meaning got rejuvenated.

Muni Shree : A word is the creation of both an idea and an action. In itself a word has no power, it is merely an indicator. A glorious act makes a word dignified. If the act is feeble, the power of the word is also enfeebled. The word *Raja* (king) which once meant God, has not more than historical significance in the present because the decline of regal action made the term unpleasant.

Rajendra : Do actions owe themselves to society or to thinking ?

Muni Shree : Every action first appears in the form of thought. Behaviour is a reproduction of thought. Thought and action are causally related. But thoughts develop within a social context. Therefore, it can be said that society enables the birth of thought and thought enables the birth of action.

Rajendra : Is thought a cause of social action or vice versa ?

Muni Shree : Social events give rise to thoughts which in turn produce actions.

Rajendra : The thoughts in us have come into existence as a reaction to external events. Therefore, they are not active but reactive. For example, the answer to a mathematical question may be unique, but it is, as it were, a slave to the question.

Jainendra : What he is saying is that man is not the Master of his thought, but its subordinate.

Muni Shree : The answer is born only after the question, therefore it is natural for it to be dependent on the question. But what occasions a thought is not merely a question, but also his inherited traits and external reaction. Why does a thought appear in the mind ? Because you carry your own genetic traits. Every thought leaves behind some reaction. What we think today the traces of its reaction outlast the thought. That is why we can recollect it. External circumstances also influence it.

Rajendra : All our thoughts are certainly filtered out of social events.

Muni Shree : Possibly yes, but it is not absolutely true. Quite often our conscious mind gets directions from the deeper subconscious mind.

Rajendra : Is something new born out of it ?

Muni Shree : There is no event which can be said to be completely new. The incarnation of *Narsingh* (sharing the form of man and lion) is

a new event, but it has a combination of man and lion All peculiarity is combinatorial in nature Even scientific experiments are not altogether new. Existence of any two is not new, what is new is the combination of any two out of infinite possibilities. What are all the medicines we have ? Nothing but botanical combinations There is nothing new from the beginning to the end What is new is the use of combination.

Jainendra . The cause of the enactment of thought is not within It is the prevalent situation or time.

Rajendra Egotism is a part of our reaction

Muni Shree : Egotism has something more to it than itself and it is combinatorial Newton gave us the Law of Gravitation The idea of the Law was born of an external factor There was no classical knowledge behind it The idea arose as soon as he saw an apple falling If the Law of Gravitation had been merely a reaction to events, it could have happened earlier also and could have been anyone else's Why did it happen to Newton only and not to someone else ? So before concluding this discussion let it be understood that anything new is born by a combination of individual competence and external event

Rajendra What is the difficulty in not accepting the soul ?

Muni Shree : There is no difficulty It is natural not to accept it Accepting it needs valour What is visible is not soul Therefore, it is easier to be a nonbeliever than to be a believer

Jainendra . Belief is something that is present right from the birth Non-belief comes with the development of the intellect I was a believer in the beginning, then for a number of years I called myself a non-believer, and now again I have started thinking that I am a believer The first spell of being a believer ended a little too soon

Muni Shree : This belief was made possible as a result of individual pursuit. Instrumentalities like the mind, the senses, the body etc are not directly helpful in gaining knowledge of the existence of the soul The doctor can dissect the body into very minute pieces, yet the soul is not seen anywhere That is why I am saying that it is surprising to believe in the existence of soul.

Jainendra . I do concede that there is something, but it is not soul

Muni Shree ; You believe in the consummation of soul, but do not believe in its uninterrupted existence Acceptance of the eternal soul is regarded to be used on faith in manifoldness Use of the intellect for the purpose results in arguments and counter-arguments between two

advocates and proves completely unavailing. It will be difficult to deny the existence of the soul once the aspect consisting faith, experience and contemplation is reinforced

Rajendra : Is is possible for consciousness to exist without the body ?

Jainendra . It is *Pret* (प्रेत) which means disembodied soul.

Rajendra Either *Pret* (प्रेत) does not exist and if it does exist it cannot be disembodied

Muni Shree : Electricity has the power to eliminate that which is manifested in a bulb Similarly soul is manifested in body.

Rajendra Why is then electricity given primacy and not the bulb ?

Muni Shree : Electricity occurs, it is not produced in the bulb Similarly, the soul is not born in the body it is interwoven with the body

Rajendra What is the scientific method of realizing that soul is different from the body ?

Jainendra . Why do you think it so necessary to press this difference ?

Muni Shree : You have laboratories You can investigate and examine the minutest parts of the body But where are the means of knowing the soul freed from the body ? We have five senses as means to cognition They can perceive sound, form, smell, taste, and touch These things can be known by the body, but there is nothing to enable us to know the soul present in the body If you are really interested in understanding the difference between the body and the soul, the means to do it is meditation. I would be surprised if such an understanding does not come as a result of adequate meditation

Jainendra It is only when religion spells valour that spirituality can be accomplished Otherwise feebleness prevails, leading to injustice

Muni Shree : There are five words rise (उत्थान), strength (बल), virility (वीर्य), exertion (पुरुषकार), and valour (पराक्रम). No religious activity is free from them They can be used in religion, war and business alike Without valour one is useless It has been taken for granted that the religious person should be tolerant. If he is slapped on one cheek, he should turn the other also to be slapped. This, however, is not valour, it is inferiority. Fasting is indicative of the soul's valour, but today it has been reduced merely to 'not eating '

Jainendra . There was valour even in the word *Jina* (जिन) (Arhat

or one of the chief saints of the Jains).

Rajendra . It is in the name Jainendra also.

Jainendra . Jainendra is a combination of *Jina* (जिन) and *Indra* (इन्द्र) Resignation (resigning before the will of someone superior) is not indicative of inferiority. To consider oneself nothing out of inferiority is being impotent. There is no inferiority in prayer, but humility and (spiritual) destitution.

Muni Shree : The feeling of being spiritually destitute implies the sovereignty of all the three worlds (this world, the other world and the nether world)

Sympathy

Behaviour showing mutual regard means sympathetic behaviour. Man as a social being has expectations under all circumstances. In fact the very basis of society is relativity (mutual expectations). It creates a loving atmosphere Neglect or lack of mutual regard leads to indifference and an increase in social distance Acharya Shree remains more busy during celebrations of special days. If someone does not get an attentive ear due to overwork, he thinks he is being treated unsympathetically This is the state of the *sadhus*. The state of others will be even more worrying. Everyman wants to be shown regard or attention. A relation based on mutual regard is sweet Where there is mutual regard, even unkind behaviour does not pinch. On the other hand, despite good behaviour if there is disregard, people take it as artificial behaviour Disregard or lack of sympathy is also responsible for bitterness in the family, since the numbers lack adequate sympathy for one another I have myself experienced that I was deemed impractical because I did not talk as much to the people as necessary due to my being busy Though I did not behave badly, I did not practise as much sympathy as was called for in social life That is why I became impractical People react negatively when the head of the family is not adequately careful in this regard. For this reason people in high places are cautious in this regard This very year during *Maryada Mahotsava* Acharya Shree told the monks and the nuns that whenever necessary they could seek appointment with him He invited each one of them and talked to them One might wonder what Acharya Shree gives to them during ten minutes' talk. The fact is that finding themselves in a sympathetic environment they have a feeling of self-esteem and gratification. One feels gratified by sympathy not by material gains.

Chandan : Is this not attachment ?

Muni Shree : It is affection. At present we are affected by our love for religion *Samyak Darshan* (right faith) has eight brief rules, one of which is Vatsalya (वात्सल्य) or affectionate love. There can be no bond of unity without affectionate love. It can bring about many happy results With affection rigorous discipline can be imposed, penitence can be enforced, and such situations can be created as are beyond imagination. The thread of affection can easily enter the eys of the needle of affection Attachment and detachment are not incompatible Attachment to one is detachment from another Attachment to the soul, the Supreme, liberation and religion is pure

Chandan Is affectionate love not infatuation ?

Muni Shree . It may be, but how can it be banished from social relations ? Take the relation between father and son If the father cares for the son, remains sympathetic towards him, the whole behaviour becomes sweet. He is bound to create enmity in the heart of the son if he behaves unsympathetically, even though a part of the family, under the impact of singleness leading him to think that man comes in the world alone, carries his own deserts with him and that it is in vain to think of friendship King Udrayan once thought that the son should not be crowned since a king is invariably damned and it would be bad to damn one's own son Hence, he crowned his nephew instead. Consequently the son turned hostile toward him and remain so until the end He swore that he would never beg pardon of his father On the other hand, the nephew grew apprehensive of a change of the mind of the king and so tried to kill the latter All this happened simply because of wrong treatment

Jainendra It is necessary to keep in mind both scientific appraisal (निश्चय) and analytical approach (व्यवहार) Can the latter be not derived from the former ? Analytical approach itself will culminate in being scientific appraisal By concentrating on the scientific appraisal, attachment and detachment could be avoided Inclination towards analytical approach will destroy scientific appraisal and *vice versa* On the contrary, if scientific appraisal is followed honestly, the analytical approach will automatically be taken care of

Muni Shree All Tirthankars (chief saints of the Jains) promote analytical approach; they promote the *Sangh* (community of monks) and they promote organization Where has the analytical approach come from ? Where did this perception come from in their lives ? Analytical approach has undoubtedly been derived from scientific appraisal. The

Tirthankars were fulfilled beings—they had successfully completed their mission. Though they had nothing to gain, even then they went on working. Nobody can ever be free from the analytical approach. It will go on so long as the body is functional. Of the twelve vows enjoined upon a *Shravak* (disciple) is an *Atichar* (transgression) that 'I will not cut off the source of livelihood of those dependent on me.' Where has this analytical approach came from ? The more religious a man, the more pleasant his behaviour

Jainendra . Religiosity will diminish in proportion to the degree of defective nature of the analytical approach (behaviour)

Muni Shree · Roopchandji Sethia was a deeply religious disciple He was as cautious about behaviour as he was religious

Chandan · Is analytical approach not fascination ?

Muni Shree Why do you see only fascination in the analytical approach ? Why don't you see the sense of justice or equality associated with it ? Imagine that a father has four sons He is more inclined towards one of them He gives that son two lacs of rupees and one lac to the second son and half a lac each to the third and the fourth The result is bound to be mutual clashes The father might consider himself to be religious, the sons would regard him irreligious and impractical If the behaviour had been influenced by religion, everyone would have been treated equally There would not have been injustice to three of them

Chandan It is right that injustice should be avoided. But is it not the previous birth which determines our feelings towards one another ?

Muni Shree There can be dissatisfaction with a *Vitarag* (one who is free from passions) also

Jainendra . Not merely dissatisfaction but acute dissatisfaction Without his posing threat to anyone Gandhi was assassinated. Jesus Christ was the very picture of love; yet he was crucified

Muni Shree Incongruity is born of one's own mentality

Jainendra Christ had love even for those who crucified him It was his great quality A worshipper of religion will be ineffectual if he looks outside himself and worries about the effects of his actions

Muni Shree · One has to be careful to ensure that hatred does not become the cause of one's actions Having the responsibility of running the household and turning away from it is bound to create difficulty.

The father of Chandanbala was King Dadhivahan. Shatanik attached his kingdom and Dadhivahan fled away out of fear. The soldiers entered and plundered the capital. The queen met her death Chandanbala was kidnapped. Shall we say that it was the feeling of nonviolence which made the king flee ? Not in the least; it was sheer cowardice. It amounted to gross irresponsibility and betrayal of everybody's trust It was not renunciation but breach of responsibility. If he had really been given to renunciation, he would not have in the first instance accepted the responsibility of ruling the state.

Chandan · Is it religious to fulfil one's responsibility ?

Muni Shree One who is cautious about his behaviour creates a liking for religion in others We are six *sadhus* One of us is ill. If I think, 'My meditation will suffer if I direct my attention towards his illness It is his destiny He has to reap the fruit of his *karmas* and I cannot do anything about it ' If I think like this, I will make people disinclined towards religion not inclined towards it.

Chandan . The wife is ill It is time for meditation. Should the husband meditate or look after his wife ?

Muni Shree . I consider meditation very essential, but how will one in practical life forget to serve in need, when it is a question of preventing people from being indifferent to religion and religious people

Jainendra . No behaviour is bad if it is full of sympathy. Indifferent or unsympathetic behaviour is in itself cruelty of some kind

Muni Shree Very often nonviolence is thought of at the final stage, whereas it should concern us in the initial state. Once Acharya Shree said, 'People think of nonviolence when they are concerned with preserving the country and not in normal times when they are concerned with keeping it and governing it. Violence has its roots not in preserving possessions but in accepting the validity of possessions.

Phool Kumari : How is one to judge behaviour when people separate as a result of the growth of the family ?

Muni Shree : Both Lord Mahavira and Lord Buddha left their home and rid themselves of family responsibility. The question of responsibility arises when the relationship is present The situation changes if a man leaves home and goes away to dwell in a forest Only that religious person makes people known to and near

him antipathetic to religion who does not fulfil the responsibility having accepted it before. All questions pertaining to behaviour cease to be meaningful if the inner feeling of renunciation becomes pronounced.

2

The Extension of Love

Extension means spreading, jumping over the bounds of the 'self' and entering the domain of the 'other', or putting an end to the boundary between the 'self' and the 'other' Businessmen expand their business to satisfy their lust, to get sexual pleasure not until then available. There is thus one kind of expansion which earns demerit, and another which causes it to be abandoned, Hatred is a demerit People think themselves to be superior and others to be inferior. Such a discrimination produce hatred The love of one's own person deepens and nothing but hatred remains to be directed at others The best way to remove hatred is to expand love to such an extent that no room is left for hatred at all

Of two men we like one and dislike another We give love to the former and intense aversion to the other In this state there is no universality or depth of love and so there is room for hatred Wherever there is hatred, there is malice too, and wherever there is malice, there is mental unrest It is impossible not to have mental unrest where there is hatred Hatred and peace of mind are incompatible

Question Should we love a contemptible thing also ?

Muni Shree : Hatred is not in the thing but in one's mind It is not possible that all objects of the world should become beautiful. There will always be a dual state But that does not necessitate hatred Is what we like beautiful ? Its true answer lies in *Anekant* (the doctrine of manifold aspects) There is a thing which is liked even though it is not beautiful. There is another thing which is beautiful and yet not liked Another thing is both beautiful and liked There is no absolute relationship between beauty and likeableness

Jainendra Is beauty independent of looks ? Does it have an independent existence ?

Muni Shree : Beauty lies in form and appearance, whereas likeableness lies in the mind Even the bitterest thing can be in the mind but that may not be likeable There is a beautiful woman but her husband

does not like her. Why ? He could not develop a mental liking for her Where there is a liking there is no hatred. If love expands in the heart it becomes secondary whether the thing facing us is attractive or not. The extension of love encompasses everything. It does not depend upon 'towards' but upon itself And if it comes to 'towards', it means 'towards all.' Love does not extend a relation but the self.

Jainendra : Possibly there is no discrimination in love ?

Mohan : A man has four sons There is no uniformity in giving to and taking from them. Why ?

Jainendra That kind of difference too can be there. It is not caused by love. The real reason for it is wisdom of distinguishing In the expansion of the self wisdom of distinguishing does not get lost, not everyone and everything is equal

Muni Shree : A *sadhu* sought permission to spend the four rainy months at the house of a prostitute The *guru* had earlier permitted *Sthulibhadra* to do so, but in this case he refused it But behind the withholding of permission was nothing but love You may call it wisdom of distinguishing if you like The permission was not granted beacuse it was in the interest of the *sadhu* not to go there. A mother does not hand over the key to the main lock to a four-year old child but gives it to an adult It does not show lack of love but the use of the wisdom to distinguish Without there being any discrimination in regard to love, wisdom dictates difference in treating different people. The discrimination is not caused by the bad behaviour of a person but by the wisdom that should a specific work be entrusted to him, he would be harmed Wisdom to distinguish is relative to the 'other', love is not so.

Mohan One's mentality reflects the character of the thing perceived

Muni Shree : Purity will not bear fruit even though one is confronted by a high ideal but one's thought is impious. No beneficence will be received if there is no faith in the idol. In itself the idol distributes neither love nor hatred Every instrumentality has this character

Jainendra . Is there no place for wisdom to distinguish in love ?

Muni Shree : Distinguishing wisdom results in behaviour, whereas love should be uniform Somebody may behave with me properly in five per cent cases and another person may do so in ten per cent cases. But love will disintegrate if it too were to be given in different proportions.

Jainendra . Relativization is quite opposite to loving others

Muni Shree : One can naturally ask what the process of extension

should be. Its first maxim is clarity of thoughts or right faith. The second maxim is use of resolution The language of the resolution should be definite and the time span should be long, as long as would result in total identification through its steady repetition. The use of the same language brings in increased clarity Varying notions will be formed by changing the language from day to day. We are recognized only by a definite form. Uniformity of form strengthens the nation. Definiteness of language, idea, place and time produces effective results.

Jainendra · Agency proves not a help but a hindrance to resolution. 'I am for love, I am for love'—saying so gives importance to love 'My love is growing'—has the notion of agency which will finally prove a hindrance If agency does not remain with oneself, competence can extend In devotional singing one gets satisfaction out of the feeling of obeisance The devotee thinks the Supreme to be all pervasive and himself to be nothing It proves the way to spirituality and identification with the Supreme I (the devotee) extend my hands to become all pervasive

Muni Shree : This is indeed the process of meditation There is only one aim—let me create such a vacuum in me that I am filled with my aim To be charged or filled with the object of meditation is meditation. Acharya Ram Sen has given great importance to this process of creating vacuum in oneself He says

'यदा ध्यानबलाद् ध्याता शून्यीकृत्य स्वावग्रहम् ।
ध्येयस्वरूपाविष्टत्वात् तादृक् सपद्यते स्वयम् ॥'

(The meditator renders his body into a vacuum through the power of meditation Then he gets completely engrossed in the aim and becomes one with it)

This is also the maxim of extending love Love for the self (soul) should be so intense that both body and mind become totally free from all other sentiments and get filled with love.

3

Abandonment or Extension of 'Mineness'

Abandonment of 'mineness' results in its extension and extension of 'mineness' results in its abandonment Though two different words, they do not have different meanings. Self-conceit and 'mineness' are the commanders of the military array of worldly attachment or delusion The war strategy of worldly attachment is extremely impenetrable

'Mineness' means imposing kinship on the non-kin. It is reflected in expressions like 'my house', 'my family', 'my body', etc the closest thing is the body Treating the body and external things as one's own is 'mineness' It is the cause of mental unrest Meeting the person one is deeply attached to gives us joy and departing from him/her causes grief More unhappiness is caused if one's own son turns out to be disobedient. If it is someone else's son that does not make us much unhappy simply because he is not our own It is 'mineness' that divides people from one another

The feeling of 'mineness' is followed by its abandonment One does not become free from 'mineness' merely by intoning 'This is not mime ' We have come to recognize certain people as our own Consequently, we love those who are ours and hate those who are not ours We do not hesitate to deceive those who are not ours in order to protect those who are ours. Injustice and exploitation are being nursed by this discrimination on the basis of 'this is mine' and 'this is not mine ' The process of abandonment is itself the process of extension Give up this feeling that 'that is mine' and treat everyone as yours. Within the narrow bonds of 'mineness' the daulism of ours and theirs remains Therefore, it creates possibilities of benefiting oneself and harming others. By extending the boundaries of 'mineness' the daulism of 'self' and 'the other' disappears As such in it the question of benefiting one

and harming another does not arise at all

The word *Akinchanya* (अकिंचन्य) means 'nothing'. Nothing is mine that is, everything is mine Someone asked Acharya Shree, 'Where are your headquarters ?' Acharya Shree replied, 'Nowhere, which means everywhere. Wherever we go, that place becomes our headquarters If it had been at one place, that would be its only location, it could not be located everywhere ' The day it dawns on me that nothing is mine, the entire wealth of the three worlds will come to belong to me. It has been rightly said

अकिंचनोहमित्यास्व, त्रैलोक्याधिपतिर्भवे ।
योगिगम्यमिदं प्रोक्त, रहस्य परमात्मन.॥'

Let us now talk of practical things Communism is the process of abandoning or eliminating 'mineness ' Theoretically communism is not bad But the way it is being implemented is not to my liking Since his birth a man is regarded as the property of the state Wealth and property too cannot be individually owned Even one's body is not one's own This is all according to the will of the government There is no willingness in it but only force Abandonment of 'mineness' can be a willing process if it is religious. The basic maxim of religion is *Bhed Vigyan* (science of differentiation)

Bhed Vigyan means accepting the separate existence of the body and the soul This alone is right faith. It has been called *Vivek Khyati* (विवेक ख्याति) in the Sankhya philosophy If the body is governed by an egotistic intellect, it is impossible to have right faith despite vast knowledge. Indian religions have always emphasized the importance of the abandonment of 'mineness ' What we should do is to give it experimental sanction It will be desirable to concentrate on the entire set of sense, language and the situation or context Look at the language of the *sadhus* They say 'This thing is in my protection ' To say 'it is mine' will invite penitence

Jainendra The word *Nishray* (निश्राय) meaning protection can be used in place of trusteeship Gandhiji was finding it difficult to find its Hindu equivalent

Muni Shree : Bhikshu Swamy and Jayacharya gave a practical shape to the abandonment of 'mineness' among the community of *sadhus* It is a major achievement of *Tera Panth*. After the rainy season groups of *sadhu* (monks) and *sadhvis* (nuns) come to pay respects to the Acharya They begin by saying 'These co-working *sadhus* and *sadhvis*, books and I surrender ourselves for your service. We are ready to stay wherever you want ' They accept food and water only after this

complete surrender.

Peace and self-awakening follow the completion of the process of the abandonment of 'mineness.' People boil milk, curdle it and then churn it. Why do they do so ? To get butter out of it. Similarly, I keep saying all our efforts are aimed at getting peace and happiness The Gita says अशान्तस्य कुतः सुखम् (How can a disturbed man get happiness ?) In the opnion of one of the Acharyas all scriptures were written with a view to obtaining peace

'शमार्थं सर्वशास्त्राणि, विहितानि मनीषिभिः।
स एव सर्वशास्त्रज्ञः यस्य शान्तं सदा मनः॥'

The donkey carrying sandalwood on its back merely suffers its burden, it does not at all enjoy its fragrance Likewise, one who always swears by the scriptures simply carries their burden and is unable to experience their spiritual fragrance It is experienced only by a person whose mind is raptured by peace

Some five or six years ago a dear person came to me He asked, 'When do you regard *guru* ?' I said, 'Myself Who regards another as *guru* ?' 'Do you not regard Acharya Tulsi your *guru* ?' he said I replied, 'I regard him so precisely because I do not see his self differnt from myself ' The *guru* and the disciple are united only when their selves are indentical Kabir says

'जब 'मैं' था तब गुरु नही, अब गुरु है 'मै' नाहिं।
प्रेम गली अति साकरी, जामे दो न समाहि ॥'

When 'I' was there, the *guru* was not there and now the *guru* is there and 'I' am not there If the 'mineness' is extended/expanded the whole world becomes one's own Then there remains no room for speaking ill of others Love is so intensely pervasive that it leaves no room whatsoever for anything that may counter it When 'mineness' is extended/ expanded to such an extent, the narrow and limited 'mineness' automatically gets eliminated Extending 'mineness' is a positive concept while abandoning 'mineness' is a negative concept But the intended meaning of both is the same First comes right faith and then is born reverence for it. The consciousness get lost in that for whom reverence is created .

'यत्रैवाहितधीः पुंसः श्रद्धा तत्रैव जायते।
यत्रैव जायते श्रद्धा, चित्तं तत्रैव लीयते॥'

Abandoning 'mineness' is a good thing, but it is only the first step Such an unambiguous experience creates reverential faith. Knowledge is fluid. Its intensified and condensed form is faith. Water is fluid and

ice is its condensed form. Milk is fluid and *khoya* (milk thickened and dehydrated by boiling) is its condensed form. Similarly, knowledge through progressive reinforcement turns into faith.

Jainendra Knowledge is gained through the intellect and faith through the innermost recesses of heart.

Ram Kumar : How can one develop faith ?

Muni Shree : Once it is known the *khoya* is formed from milk, one has to spend time in boiling and thickening it. In the same way once the process of the abandonment of 'mineness' is known, it has to be practised over a period of time.

Madan Is public life not hampered by the abandonment of 'mineness'?

Muni Shree : Not only will there be no hampering, but it will become healthier. Hindrance is caused when something gets abandoned not when one abandons something Once some refugees came to Acharya Shree and said, 'We have lost everything ' Acharya Shree said, 'You have no wealth, nor do we You have no house, nor do we You have been separated from your families; we too are away from our families You and we are in the same state, but our experiences differ The reason is that in your case you have been deprived of those things, whereas we have abandoned them on our own '

Phool Kumari : If 'mineness' is extended while remaining in the family, will it not result in bitterness ?

Jainendra (clarifying the above question) It is an important question Let us take a member of the family He wants to extend his 'mineness' he progressively keeps extending his mineness' to people increasingly distant from his kith and kin It causes problems in the family Once the point came up that it is necessary to become Supreme from being an individual But how can it happen since the Supreme is infinite ? One does not have to become Supreme, if the individual self is extripated, all its boundaries are destroyed It becomes Supreme till infinity A spoonful of sugar dropped into a glass of milk will permeate the whole glass not in its one-eighth part. The process of extension is not partial and quantitative, but qualitative Let us think that there is an amount of Rs 50,000/- Twenty people are born of the same parents and another twenty belong to the family Those among them who felt like abandoning their 'mineness' reduced their accumulations It is possible by giving up accumulations

Muni Shree : If the abandonment of 'mineness' assumes the

character of charity, bitterness can accrue. But no bitterness can be there if its character is one of sacrifice There is a big diference between *charity* and *sacrifice* The self is mixed with charity whereas sacrifice is free from it Fear and worry connected with 'mineness' turn into fearlessness and carefreeness once they are severed from 'mineness.' This is an unfailing formula for mental peace

4

Sympathy

The word *Sahanubhuti* (sympathy) is made up of three parts—*Sah* (सह), *Anu* (अनु), and *Bhuti* (भूति) Bhuti means 'to be', i.e. existence I am, this is my existence, my personality In spirituality there is individualism, in it the individual simply *is* or *exists* 'I am' indicate pure existence. 'I am so and so' indicates social existence 'I am scholarly,' 'I am wealthy,' 'I am religious'—in these statements an adjective is used to qualify 'I' and as soon as it is done we move from the world of *Bhuti* (to be) into the world of *Anubhuti* (experience or sensibility) I often used to think which line divided man and society Now I know that it is *Bhuti* (to be) On one side of it is the individual, on the other is society Joining gives the meaning of *Bhuti*, to be at the back of something *Anubhuti* is not independent It has no independent existence whether it is sensory or mental

The independence of our social life is relative Sensory and mental world cannot be altogether absolute There are various limits to freedom Independence can exist only where there is only action and no reaction One of the children throws a lump of earth at another The second child throws it back at the first This is reaction to the original action Now the question arises as to whether the throwing of the lump by the first child is not an action. It is not—it is also a reaction No action is ever possible without *Bhuti* (being or existence) Every action is bound to genetic traits and memory It does not make sense that any action either motivated by or hindered by memory can ever be independent Reaction means the restriction of personality In the social world what happens is not action but reaction Experience or sensibility is sociality One more word *sah* (with, together) added and then it becomes pure sociality. For example, *Sah-shiksha* (co-education), *Sah-chintan* (thinking together), *Sah-bhojan* (eating together), etc. Sympathy is an important social quality Where *Anubhuti* (sensibility or feeling) is not *sah* (together), selfishness gets an opportunity to grow

Exploitation takes place in the absence of sympathy. If somebody is endowed with sympathy, he can never exploit others One who is conscious as much of other's existence as of one's own can never exploit or be unjust to others. The growth in cruelty can be directly attributed to the indiffernce to sympathy. With sympathy in one's life cruelty can never grow. Too much concentration on oneself gives rise to cruelty and nonviolence and compassion takes a back seat Selfishness is nursed in the absence of sympathy. Conflict, perplexity etc. also prosper in the absence of sympathy There is inconsistency in accepting sociality and rejecting sympathy.

Shuddhopayaga is the state of individuality even amidst social living In it there is nothing beyond the state of being or existence It is a process of ridding oneself of mental afflictions *Samya Yoga, Chitta Nirodh, Dhyan* or *Shuddopayoga* is a state where conciousness is not tagged on to any external object or sensual pleasure Mental affliction is caused when *Shuddopayoga* is combined with external objects. 'I am happy' is not indicative of *Shuddopayoga*. The concept 'happiness' when combined with me relegates my being to a secondary position. Happiness is not natural; it is dependent on or relative to appearances. 'I am unhappy'—this is the experience of an affliction. There is a state of spontaneous joy—beyond the ordinary states of happiness, unhappiness, and mental affliction—and that is *Shuddopayoga.*

If we had been imbued with the state of *Shuddopayoga*, we would not have needed sympathy at all. My sensibility would not have been related to or resulting from another object. But we live on the basis of experiences and so are not free from being related or sequent to others. No matter who and what they are—*sadhus*, ascetics, or businessmen, or people attached to activity or detached from it—they cannot disconnect themselves from the question of sociality

So long as we are associated with body, mind and speech, it is not possible for us to disregard the importance of sympathy The governing principle of sympathy is that we should use our external freedom consistent with the freedom of others

If we treat Dada Dharmadhikari as a guest, his freedom will be hindered and we too shall be burdened with constraint. We are human beings; he too is a human being Between us, therefore, there is a direct relationship Neither are we hampered by his system, nor is he hampered by our system For freedom all that man needs is to be man. As one man to another man people should be directly related to each other

Present day relation is not of the above type. one man needs money

while another has the ability to give away money. This is a relation of the giver and the non-giver. Similarly. there are innumerable relations like that of the master and the servant, protector and the protected etc

All such relations are merely combinational, they are not based on human considerations In the world of words also there are lots of combinations. Pure or single words are fewer in number There are three kinds of words roots, combinations or compounds and mixed. Most of them are either compounds or mixed

Social conciousness is influenced by tradition. No one can survive by abandoning it. A man is enjoying all modern facilities like a personal car, radio etc , but if he is deprived of the sympathy of his father, he will feel like living in a prison. Everyone needs love In its absence a man sometimes feels bored Sympathy seems to be essential to relate people living on the social plane. Freedom from attachment and hatred is very good, but its ostentatious form—glorification of self—is not good Do statements like 'I drank' my bullock drank,' 'Let the well sink,' constitute or indicate freedom from attachment and hatered ? It is merely gratifying one's selfishness Selfishness leaves no room for caring for others On attaining freedom from attachment and hatred the activity of 'being' becomes so strong that no room is left for sensibility or experience. Problems arise where there is sensibility and where there is no room for togetherness

Two men sat in each other's company. One man's eating cannot remove the hunger of the other Food satisfies the hunger only of the person who eats, and hunger is satisfied proportionate to the amount of food eaten. One cannot deny this individual limitation However, eating together gives mental satisfaction. The feeling of satiety, both physical and mental, comes as a result of togetherness or '*Sah*' Wherever there is '*Sah*', problems get solved. People of lower status think those of higher status are not with them Younger people think those who are old are not with them There is no togetherness even when they live together This feeling of separateness puts a question mark on sociality Social harmony is possible only if that question is solved .

'सङ्गच्छध्वं संवदध्वं सं वो मनांसि जानताम् ।
देवा भागं यथा पूर्वे सञ्जानानाम् उपासते॥'

I find the above Vedic hymn very attractive. In *Jain Sutras,* there is a mention of *Sadharan Sharirijeeve* (साधारण शरीरीजीव), which means many living creatures within one body. They eat, breathe, experience happiness or sorrow and die together The world will be metamorphosed if the above traits were to be shared by man. Even a lower order

analogue of the above, the universalization of the feeling that 'This work of mine will cause anguish to others' will remove cruelty from society

So long as the above state is not created, many factors capable of causing mental restlessness keep presenting themselves. Many a time we become one-sided. Sometimes we stop short of the motive (हेतु) and at other times go as far as the material cause (उपादान). Neither of them singly is adequate Action requires the combination of both Absence of any one of them renders the action impossible

There is a principle of Naturopathy that any external factor becomes instrumental in the emergence of disease if its material cause is present inside the body No external instrumentality can cause disease if the internal material cause is absent It is the combination of the two which makes the disease manifest

Everybody has in him the feeling of nonviolence or compassion as well as that of hatred They emerge only when some external instrumentality is there.

Today people are using the *Anuvrat* platform for thinking of an experimental form of religion or the formation of a nonviolent society In this context I want to say that peace cannot be achieved without removing the spiritual delusion caused by high selfishness or in other words without extending the bounds of sympathy

5

Tolerance

Sahishnuta (सहिष्णुता) means tolerance. It has another meaning—power. Tolerance proves useful to man only when both the meanings are combined Powerless tolerance is dependence, not the vigour of one's independent consciousness. There is human touch where tolerance is accompanied by power There is neither egotism nor a feeling of inferiority Both egotism and inferiority signify imbalance They cannot be instrumental in touching the human conscience. For that touch equity and balance are needed. Disparity as a part of one's nature sunders *human relations. Two persons can be mutually related only when both* have a feeling of parity and harmony, and are devoid of inferiority as well as egotism. What else is *Adhyatma Yoga* ? It is nothing but parity and harmony Acharya Soma Deva Suri has regarded a harmonious relation between the soul, the mind, and reality as *Adhyatma Yoga :*

'आत्ममनोमरुत्तावद्समतायोगलक्षणोह्यध्यात्मयोगः।'

Why is tolerance needed ?

People are not equal to one another from the point of view of likes, thoughts, genetic traits and work It does not cause any difficulty that they are not uniform in external form. But difficulty does arise on account of lack of uniformity of likes etc That difficulty can be solved only by tolerance. As soon as intolerance is practised the situation becomes intractable. Once hands, tongue, teeth, legs, etc., got together. All felt that while they worked the stomach did not. They decided not to cooperate with an organ that did not work with them, and did not contribute anything They went on strike After a couple of days the hands lost vigour, the tongue started tasting foul, the mouth got filled with saliva and the teeth became dirty and started smelling. They met again on the third day and called off the strike.

Every individual has his own likes But things would become

impossible if in a camp having some fifty people, different types of curries were to be made For avoiding such a situation harmonization of likes is necessary. Tolerance is nothing but such a harmonization of diverse likes. In its absence people do not unite but divide

Tolerance is extremely necessary to keep an organization strong. It is all the more necessary in the case of the chief of the organization. Shree Krishna was the head of the, republic. Akrur and Bhojavanshi were leaders of the opposite party They were highly critical of Shree Krishna. One day he felt sad at their criticism Just then *Naradji* happened to come there and asked, 'Why are you so sad ?' Krishna replied, 'I am sick of these people. Please show me the way of this state ' Narad said, 'There are two kinds of dangers—external and internal Yours is an internal one The external danger can be removed by arms No arms can be helpful in removing the internal danger.' 'What should be done in that case ?' asked Krishna. At this point Narad advised him to hold his tongue with the weapon of Anayas

'अनायसेन शस्त्रेन, मृदुना हृदयच्छिदा।
जीवमुद्धर सर्वेषा परिमृज्यानुमृज्य च॥'

There is no just one type of weapons Once the king asked Birbal, 'What is a weapon ?' Birbal replied, 'An opportunity ' The king expressed his surprise and said, 'What are you talking ? A sword or a spear or a gun can be termed weapons But how can an opportunity be a weapon ?' At this Birbal said, 'I will prove it some day.' One day the king was marching in a procession. One of the elephants turned wild and started running Birbal came forward, looked in all directions and found that besides a dog there was no one else there Quickly he caught hold of one of the dog's legs and swinging it struck the elephant with it. The elephant went back. Is dog a weapon ? But given the opportunity it turned into a weapon. Even *Shāstras* (scriptures) sometimes turn into *Shastras* (weapons) The only difference between the two words is that of a vowel-mark.

Man can go astray more with the use of words and scriptural authority than by weapons. Sometimes even scriptures turn into weapons.

Krishna asked, 'What is this weapon called *Anāyas Shastra* (अनायस शस्त्र) ? (i.e. a weapon not made up of iron) Narad replied .

'शक्त्यान्नदानं सततं, तितिक्षार्जवमार्दवं।
यथार्हप्रतिपूजा च शस्त्रमेतदनायसनम्॥'

(Give as much food to the opponents as you can, Have patience

and endurance—do not go into a rage the moment you hear their words. Behave in an upright manner. Observe courtsey. Respect the elders This is *Anāyas Shastra*, a weapon with no iron You can captivate the opponents with this weapon.'

Krishna responded thus 'Am I so weak and powerless that I should keep enduring their foul speech ?'

When abused, a person as a reaction hurls abuses on the abuser only because of this thought, 'Am I weak ?' One's egotism is promptly aroused followed by a reaction. Narad said that only that person can endure or show tolerance who is great :

'नाऽमहापुरुषः कश्चित् नाऽनात्मा नाऽसहायवान् ।
महतीं धुरमाधत्ते, तामुधम्योरसा वह॥'

You have to rotate the axle One who is not great cannot tolerate One who is not spiritual cannot tolerate One who is not of a helping nature cannot tolerate Are you great, spiritual and of a helping nature ? A weak person can never be tolerant *Only the powerful can be tolerant* There is a curtain here behind us Our protection from the sun and the existence of the curtain are both related. Likewise, being powerful and not getting ungry are related

Tolerance is a pre-requisite to mental peace It is an important part of *Pramod-Bhavana* (प्रमोद-भावना), which means not to be jealous of the good points of another person, but to be happy at them *Pramod-Bhavana* will develop only where there is tolerance.

There was a millionaire family which had everything conceivable In it one person was mainly in charge of the family affairs while others assisted him Once a thought occurred to them This fellow merely orders about We do real business, but he is given credit for it Once intolerance arose, everyone separated The result was that the chief of the family set up his own business since he was a competent person But the others got into serious difficulty

The thought to insult others is also born of intolerance. Once two *Pandits* (learned Brahmins) visited a wealthy merchant One of them went away for a while to attend to some work The merchant asked the second *Pandit* to tell him something about the other who had temporarily withdrawn from there The *Pandit* said, 'I have not known him for long. He joined me only a little while ago It seems he is obstinate and stupid like a bull.' When the first *Pandit* returned the other had to go out for some work The merchant asked him the same question about the other *Pandit* He said, 'The other one knows nothing He is an ass ' The merchant while serving dinner to them put cut straws before

one (alleged to be an ass) and fodder before the other (alleged to be a bull). The *Pandits* felt insulted The merchant said he had acted according to the introduction of each given by the other. Both the *Pandits* hung their heads in shame

Take any field of life Can art, literature and religion progress if one artist, man of letters and religious person does not praise another artist, man of letters and religious person. People want to see happiness and peace everywhere in society Why are happiness and peace not there ? Any consideration of the above question leads directly to the political and economic disorder in the country. It is true that system has its effect on things But it is conveniently ignored that the individual's own nature has such an effect. It amounts to being alert about the external and a kind of hide and seek with the spiritual. People do not rate spirituality high It gives neither food, nor clothing, nor shelter. But these items are meant for man and man's developemnt depends on spirituality If the very person for whom things are meant does not undergo development, what good are food, clothing and shelter ? Things have no intrinsic value, it is man who has it. If the mind is devoid of joy and enthusiasm but the external acquisitions are intact, the absence of the former renders everything else useless I do not suggest that the externals be overlooked What I do say is that special attention should be paid to man If there is nothing that can bring happiness and equanimity to man's mind, he will become lifeless Mind is the source of all good and evil Cultivation of tolerance is essential for augmenting mental power. The developemnt of mental power is the same as development of tolerance. Similarly, a decline in mental power means the decline of tolerance

6

Development of Justice (Nyaya)

What is justice ? There is the word *Niti* (नीति) and another word *Nyaya* (न्याय) *Niti* means 'that which carries ' Thus, *Niti* is the path and *Nyaya* is the goal The destination is *Nyaya*, which literally means 'to return.' Birds are in flight during the day but return to the nest in the evening The principles of Sanskrit grammar have been compared to an old man's staff 'न्यायाः स्थविरयष्टिप्रायाः ।' When necessary the old man uses it as a support, otherwise he carries it in his hand It is not necessary to use it as support at all places. Perhaps it is true of every rule or principle. The forms of justice keep changing with the times. History bears testimony to the fact that in the feudal age keeping slaves was regarded just—it enjoyed state sanction The slave's duty was to serve the master. It was unjust for him to live in freedom His ears, nose or any other limb could be severed at the sweet will of the master, so much so that he could even be punished with death All these things were not regarded injutice on the part of the master In that age one could own as much wealth as he liked. Even though others owned nothing, the disparity was not considered an injustice It was thought that power and wealth went together

Religious justice meant the wife burning herself alive on the pyre of her husband This religious practice enjoyed general acceptance Thus, justice appeared in different forms in social, political, and religious fields

Today those principles of justice have changed So far as keeping a slave is concerned, it is unimaginable. Cruel treatment of the servant is regarded contemptible. Even accumulation of wealth is close to being regarded an injustice It is held to be unjust that while one man is a millionaire another is a pauper.

The basis of justice is equality To put it in one word, disparity is injustice and parity is justice Having one-sided view is injustice, having inclusive view is justice

There should be no mechanical equality. Mechanically produced things can have the same shape and size The quality of consciousness become meaningless if people have mechanical equality. The very existence of man implies seeking liberation from mechanical equality. I have never been impressed by an equality which manifests itself in external form. Far from being unpleasant, diversity is a pleasant thing. One will not be happy to have only one kind of trees all over Delhi. In ancient times one of the ways of punishing someone by a ruler was to keep him in a house painted all over with the same colour. As a result eyes used to get spoiled. In the absence of a different sight eyes used to become weak. Man wants variety. A variety of things pleases the heart If every human being looked alike, there would be no beauty. Individual identification would not have been possible Seeing one would have amounted to seeing all and there would have been no differentiation There can be no equality in the external environment, nor is it desirable Equality should be in the mind and the heart It is immaterial if external appearances are diverse. External disparity causes no unhappiness if the mind and the heart are inspired by equality It is inequality inside the mind that causes unhappiness when it shows itself in external effects. A cat seizes both the kitten and the rat with its teeth The teeth are the same but the feeling in the heart is different in the two cases. One is inspired by affection, another by cruelty A man embraces his daughter and also his wife The embrace is common but the feelings of the mind are different The hand is raised automatically. But its character changes when a finger is raised in order to frighten somebody Where is the impulse for frightening ? In the finger or in the mind ? The finger goes up as soon as the feeling of frightening somebody appears in the mind The thumb is shown as soon as hatred fills the mind. The internal feeling emerges in external behaviour like the swift current of electricity

The basic cause of disparity is the human mind. It expresses itself through language. Anger makes the eyebrows tense. Hatred makes the nose pucker. Language is meant to express our thoughts and feelings. The mind is a party to *Sthayi Bhava* or sentiments, *Sanchari Bhava* (transitory states or feelings giving rise to different *Rasas* or sentiments like the erotic sentiment) and other states or feelings of this kind. The eyes in themselves are cold and stiff like glass They are enlivened by the soul.

Look into the centre of the mind. You will find inestimable disparity. Things would have been different today if the internal disparity had been given the attention so far given to external disparity. A preceptor said to the disciple, 'Go and measure the length of the snake.'

He measured the length mark of snake on the ground. The preceptor thought his purpose was not fulfilled He asked him a second time, 'Go and count the fangs of the snake ' The disciple did not feel bad and did not interpret it in terms of disparity and an effort to kill him He obeyed the preceptor and tried to count the fangs and in the process the snake bit him The preceptor asked him to come back He made him lie down and put a blanket on him. The disciple perspired profusely and the maggots and vermins came out along with the sweat. The disciple was cured of his ailment and became healthy and attractive. This mode does not recommend itself as a rule applied in cases of distress. From the outside it looked like disparity, but internally there was an ocean of love One does not mind anything where there is genuine internal love. On the contrary, one does not like an ostentatious parity attended by lack of love inside Therefore, it is vital to develop parity within. One does not feel pained even to sacrifice one's life for the sake of those one is deeply related to

Law is an external imposition. Spirituality, on the other hand, emanates from out of the heart and affects the external factors Problems arise because the mind and the heart are not paid proper attention to One does not mind anything if one is sure that there is no disparity within External disparity or anamoly is not resented if it is like the gentle stroke of a potter meant for the good of the family and the world

Injustice is done not only to others but to oneself also. Are we not doing injustice to ourselves through our food habits ? Injustice is done to both the teeth and the intestines Lack of adequate chewing weakens the teeth and causes pyorrhoea For want of chewing enough saliva does not go into the intestines and they find it difficult to digest the food Then there are people who drink tea and milk so hot that even the container has to be caught with iron forceps. How will intestines handle the heat we dare not bear with touch Even though aware of indigestion, a man keeps eating to gratify the palate He has to bear the consequences. Similarly, other senses are also subjected to injustice

A One-sided Viewpoint

Some people get so much inclined towards religions that they become oblivious of everything else. There are some who are so much after wealth that they do not mind sacrificing even their lives for its sake Yet others are inclined towards sex Such one-sidedness causes mental unrest Sociologists in the past reached the conclusion in this matter, after a good deal of deep deliberation, that *Dharma*, *Artha*, and *Kama* (discharge of duty, acquirement of wealth, gratification of the desire for

sex—three of the four objects of life) should be treated as mutually opposing feelings.

Imagine a man who wants to live a householder, and to keep his children and other family members with him, and at the same time to give up his domestic responsibilities It represents utter confusion. Once a man asked Acharya Shree, 'What is the good of giving grass fodder to a cow ?' Acharya Shree replied, 'The same as accrues from keeping a cow.' The man is a victim of confusion who keeps a cow and drinks its milk, but wonders what good it is to give it grassfodder Giving grass-fodder is deemed bad when man suffers from selfishness. Milking the cow and drinking the milk does not look bad. Acharya Bhikshu explained selfishness by giving an example. 'Four people got a cow as *Dakshina* (respectful donation). They arrived at a common understanding that each one of them will milk it by turn The first one did not give any fodder to the cow saying to himself the second one will give it the next day The second one did not give it saying to himself that the first one must have already given it on the previous day and the third one will give it the following day And so on Everyone milked the cow but none gave it fodder. As a result the cow died

It is not just to make use of family but refuse to fulfil one's obligations towards it Likewise, it is not just to give exclusive importance to any of the trio of *Dharma*, *Artha*, and *Kama* Therefore Acharya Somdeve has said ·

Overindulgence in *Dharma* suppresses *Kama* and *Artha*

Overindulgence in *Kama* suppresses *Dharma* and *Artha*

Overindulgence in *Artha* suppresses *Dharma* and *Kama*

One-sided viewpoint is incomplete External parity is effective only when it is inspired by beauty, love and holiness This is possible through justice So long as justice is not there, there can be no mental peace *Mental peace dwells inside the mind, it does not dwell in the external environment. If the mind is restful and relaxed, man can experience peace even in the midst of noise, but if the mind is not restful and relaxed, he cannot experience peace even in a forest*

'This is a village and that is a forest'—such a thought belongs to people who are not spiritually degraded. But for those who have realized themselves, there is no differnce between a village and a forest '

The more we stretch outside, the farther away we go from the soul This is injustice. To be 'installed' in or to dwell in the soul is justice The question of injustice disappears when there is harmony between the language of justice and the inner self

7

Understanding Circumstances

The atoms of darkness change into bright light the moment the rays of the sun touch a surface If the world of matter did not have the capacity to change, things would have for ever remained as they were But this is not the case Everything existent changes and changes every moment. Matter undergoes changes too subtle to be perceived by our gross eyes Being subtle, we are hardly aware of the transformation brought about by the change Changes brought about by gross causes are themselves gross and the causes too are evident The effects of some causative factors are felf even after they are extinct, while those of others are felt only so long as they last. A piece of red cloth can make a crystal appear red so long as the latter is under its effect Once the cloth is removed, its effect too disappears Take another example. A man stumbles on a stone and gets hurt The contact with the stone was momentary, but its effect lasts a long time A thing receives a new formal look if the causes are adequately present Since it is very clear and gross, we call it a change.

Change is born of two originals—the material cause and the instrumental cause Competence becomes operational by combining with favourable circumstances Without the latter it will not be able to fructify If competence is *ab initio* absent, circumstances can be of no avail Change occurs only when both original competance and favourable circumstances combine properly The heat of the sun makes the earth intensely hot, but it has not effect on the sky. Even the sun cannot heat that which has no capacity to absorb heat The earth does have that capacity, but it cannot be hot without the sun.

Circumstances do not constitute merely an external environment. They are intertwined by both internal and external strands. Everything has its own natural characteristic. Chilies do not share the sweetness of grapes and grapes do not share the pungency of chilies. One strand in the texture of circumstances is the limitation of the natural

characteristic.

Millet ripens in the rainy season, while gram ripens in winter. Gram is not sown in *Asharh* (the fourth month of the Hindu calendar) and millet is not sown in *Migsar* (the ninth month of the Hindu calendar) The second strand in the texture of circumstances is the limitation of time.

A house has electricity It is capable of lighting the house. But if these is no hand to press the switch, the house is not lighted. The third strand in the texture of circumstances is the limitation of human endeavour.

Man has in him the inherent instinct for light. That is why he wants the protection of light in the midst of darkness The inherent instincts do not merely knock at the door of future achievements, they even open it wide. The fourth strand in the texture of circumstances is the limitation of genetic traits or destiny

The world is regulated by universal laws They cannot be transgressed. One of the laws is constancy or eternality Anything true is constant or eternal. The world was based and will continue to be based on this principle. The second law of the world is changeability or variability Anything true is variable. The world has changed or transformed and will continue to change on the basis of this law Variability is an inevitable law of the world Therefore, something changes and something becomes the cause of change. The fifth strand in the texture of circumstances is a fixed order of things of destiny—a universal law.

Many potentialities of a thing do not manifest themselves for want of proper circumstances Even the *karmas* accumulated in the previous birth do not fully fructify in the absence of proper circumstances Geographical environemnt affects the size, look and complexion of the body Mental ups and downs are influenced by external contacts Thoughts are affected by external contacts No man is immune to the effects of circumstances, so long as he is within their zone of influence. Man starts shivering as chilly winds blow The shivering is not without a cause. He starts sweating profusely under the scorching heat of the sun. The sweating is not without a cause Man gets enraged when he encounters anything contrary to his heart's desire He becomes arrogant on getting something he had not even imagined. Happiness, elation, fear, grief—all these sensations are expressed as a result of circumstances. They disturb the balance of the mind. As a result; the mind becomes restless

It is impossible for the mind to remain unaffected by circumstances in whose sphere of influence it operates. But if animated and inspired by the right sentiment, it can come out of the sphere of influences and then he is not longer a plaything in the hands of circumstances

The mind firmed up by an understanding of transcience does not get afflicted by the joys and sorrows of meeting and separation respectively The mind firmed up with the knowledge of shelterlessness never feels helpless The mind inspired by the feeling of oneness does not become sad in the face of social struggles The mind animated by the feeling of friendliness is freed from the vicious circle of apprehension, mistrust, doubt, fear and malice The mind given to mirth is not infested by jealousy Cruelty disappears from the mind filled with compassion. The mind not given to extremes saves itself from anger and disappointment

Not having favourable circumstances, having unfavourable circumstances, feeling of helplessness, conflict, doubt, fear malice, jealousy, cruelty, anger, and disappointment create an imbalance in the mind An unbalanced mind suffers from restlessness which swallows up happiness Contemplation, peace and happiness are causally related. The Gita says

'न चाभावयतः शान्तिः, अशान्तस्य कुत सुखम् ?'

There is no peace without contemplation and nothing can happen in the absence of peace. Contemplation is the process of transforming inherited traits Constant reflection, thinking and practice in accordance with life's objective cause the inherited traits to be undone and new traits to be formed

No one can acquire peace without first destroying the inherited traits responsible for unrest Circumstances do not always remain the same Sometimes they are favourable and sometimes unfavourable. He who feels intensely happy in favourable circumstances cannot avoid being intensely and in unfavourable circumstanfces. That man remains unaffected by circumstances who consecrates his consciousness and dedicted efforts with the experience of truth Untruth exercises a magnetic influence on the effect of circumstances Truth lacks that magnetism Therefore, it is unable ot attract the effect of circumstances Fire destroys many things, but it cannot destroy the non-existent Only that mind is afflicted by circumstances which has not been animated by the contemplation of truth

8

An All-inclusive Viewpoint

The most primary value of life is mental peace One should think about the peace of mind in a natural but total manner That which is done after planning is not very good That which comes out spontaneously is natural. That which happens as a result of the application of the intellect is not natural The tree and the pitcher are transient because they are made or created But space is parennial because it is not made or created. The value of that which is Made is not permanent That which is accomplished naturally is good.

I have determined sixteen brief rules for attaining the peace of mind Initially I did not think they had any sequential order But it appears now that they do have it They body and the mind are intimately related The mind is intimately related with the senses also Regulating them is also very essential A *Yoga* scholar says

'तत्त्वविज्ञानवैराग्यरुद्धचित्तस्य खानि मे।
न मृतानि न जीवन्ति न सुप्तानि न जाग्रति॥'

By dedicated practice let us transform our senses so that they are neither dead nor alive, neither asleep nor awake. No dead, because they retain the capacity to sense the environment. Not alive, because they do not retain sensuality. Not asleep, because in eschewing sensuality there is no helplessness as in sleep. Not alive, because they are not inclined towards sensual pleasure.

Between the senses and the soul is the mind When the mind is externally oriented, the senses become tuned to the outside world, and when it is internally oriented, they get tuned to the inner world Since the mind is affected by external conflicts we have deliberated on them too.

What is there that does not affect the mind ? The solar universe, the world of vegetation, the world of being and the world of atoms—all of them affect the mind. The learned teachers of *Yoga* have made a deep investigation of these matters

The mind is related to external sights, both pleasant and unpleasant. I have my eyes open, but they are not fixed on or directed at any thing Yet the fact is that countless atoms are passing by and are being touched by the eyes. An American woman photographed the light atoms Keeping in mind the effect of the atoms on me I cannot easily say that I am thinking independently Every man is affected by external circumstances and factors Today no being either on the earth or in the atmosphere is fully independent. It will be the height of ignorance to support absolutism since every single thought is the product of innumerable factors

Our viewpoint should be relative or qualified There are many considerations behind every thought A relative or qualified view strengthens our peace of mind On the other hand, a one-sided or absolutist view gives birth to mental unrest

During the past three weeks, you listened to me, Jainendraji and Dada Dharmadhikari Sometimes it appeared that we were drifting apart, at other times it appeared that we were getting closer to one another. Sometimes we appeared to be holding opposite views and at other times we seemed to be talking the same thing

There are countless ways in the world Man, therefore, loses his way and does not know which way to go Who should he listen to and whom should he believe ? He is unable to decide One man's views strike as right at one time, but they appear to be wrong when counter-arguments are given by another man It is anybody's guess how many webs of arguments and ideologies there are

Take the *Mahabharat*. At some places you will find endlessness attributed to time. All things are accomplished according to time There is a fixed time for the sun to rise, for trees to bear fruits, for the rains to arrive Man too takes birth and dies when the time comes It appears that there is nothing else besides time

When it comes to human endeavour, one gets the feeling that all that matters is human effort The only right thing is to engage oneself in efforts

Likewise, there are thousands of reference to fate or destiny Highly learned people are rendering service while illiterates are rolling in wealth Years of efforts proved of no avail Fatalists maintain that everything will happen as destined None can order things to happen. There is no end to ideologies and the mind gets completely confused. There are many people who are always lost in coflicting principles and as a result they lose their peace of mind. Mental peace is impossible if

we adopt one-sided ideas. Therefore, our viewpoint should be relative. No one has the linguistic means to encode the truth I am speaking and I know that I am saying something definitive only on a fragment of infinite truth. Truth is murdered the moment one takes the part to be the whole

Knowledge is good. But if one gets exclusively concerned with it, one turns away from actions. The situation arising out of the consciousness of turning away from action is expressed thus :

'दुभगाभरणमिव देहखेदावहमेव ज्ञानं स्वयमनाचरतः ।'

The knowledge of one who does not act is a burden on the body like the elegant make-up and adornment of a widow.

Forgiveness is good but its goodness has not been conceded under all circumstances That is why it is said that

'क्षमा भूषणं यतीनां न भूपतीना ।'

Contentment is good There is no happiness comparable to it but it makes a king lose his kingdom . 'सतुष्टो राजा विनश्यति ।'

A contented businessman is also ruined

Every idea is born in a context. In that context alone it is and should be evaluated

Truth is infinite. No single word or language can express even a part of it We often state that the All-knowing can know but cannot express That is why it has been said that which is capable of being intimated or announced is infinite Even a part of it cannot be conveyed through speech

Even one who knows the word equivalents of all the substances of the three worlds (this world, the other world and the nether world) cannot explain just a thousand word equivalents out of endless equivalents of even a single substance.

It is untrue that only that much is right as a man knows, or that only that which he knows is right and the rest is not right

Similarly, how can it be maintained that only that which was known in the past is right and that all else is not right ? Did our ancestors ever say that they had discovered and expressed the whole truth and did they close all doors to future discovery of truth ? It should be accepted that new achievements will continue to be made as long as the world lasts or man lives, or the soul is adored, or the truth is sought. With such a clear understanding there is no likelihood of the peace of mind being disturbed.

Dada Dharmadhikari threw light on the production of wealth and its distribution. Jainendraji mostly shed light on external circumstances,

but sometimes on the innerness too. I talked about peace of mind

All these deliberations and discussions are one-sided. But life does not have only one aspect While talking of mental peace, can the mention of food be avoided ? Can a hungry man read ? Can a thirsty man quench his thirst by enjoying literature ? Once a patient set out on a quest of health he visited physicians practising different systems like *Ayurveda, Homeopathy, Allopathy, Yunani* and *Naturopathy*. Each one emphasized the importance of his system and decried the rest. I have myself heard the views of many Naturopaths They feel elated in rejecting Allopathy. I myself emphasized the Naturopathic system But I do not like insisting on any one system What will Naturophathy do where surgery is needed ? Those practising Ayurveda reject Allopathy They say, 'Allopathic medicines suppress the disease and a reaction follows leading to the emergence of other diseases.' The Ayurvedic system tries to root out the disease, while Allopathy afforts momentary relief While Ayurveda is capable of long-term treatment. Allopathy is capable of short-term treatment One can approximate truth by taking into consideration the individual, the place, the time and the existing situation An absolute view cannot help reach truth

There are many people who stress the importance of spirituality but do not like Yogic postures, breath control exercises etc. There are diseases in which Yogic postures and breath control exercises are useful For attaining a particular state, religion is instrumental and essential, but in the liberated state religion becomes non-essential. Insistence on absoluteness is not right in any field whatsoever Continuing to believe in the universality of something leads to difficulties

In practical life we are advised to speak neither truth likely to hurt others, nor untruth, but partial truth Let me tell a story in this context Once upon a time a one-eyes king invited a few painters He said to them, 'The portrait you make of me should be beautiful and true but no barely true ' He announced a prize of a lac of rupees for the best portrait. All the painters wondered how to fulfil the king's conditions Three of them agreed to do the king's portrait One of them having completed it took to the king, who saw it and said, 'The portrait is beautiful and lifelike but not true because it shows both the eyes normal ' To the other painter he said, 'Your portrait is beautiful and live, but it portrays the bare truth by showing me one-eyed '

The third made the king's portrait after keen and penetrating thinking. He drew an imaginary portrait depicting the king stringing the

bow so that one of his eyes got hidden behind the raised hand. The king expressed his joy at the portrait and rewarded him with a lac of rupees. The third portrait was neither untrue nor bare (a depiction of naked truth), but partly true

Many people pride themselves on calling a spade a spade Many people resort to untruth to please others. It does them no good Partial truth is both acceptable and useful

Our viewpoint should be complete, harmonious and relative A complete viewpoint is not far removed from truth A garland is made of diverse ideas having a common thread running through them. This is *Anekant* (indeterminancy or absence of opposition between extremes). If we cannot weave a garland, all the beads will scatter

I have no right to impose truth on anyone I am bound to *Syadvada* (the doctrine of qualified or non-absolute assertion). I feel that if the eyes are directed towards truth, life will have no unhappiness Acharya Shree has given me the approach grounded in truth or true sight For researching in *Agams* (Jain canonical texts) Acharya Shree told me, 'We are doing an extremely responsible job Never think in terms of sectarianism about our beliefs Express only that which strikes true. It may be mentioned what our traditional beliefs are, but truth should not be tinged with our beliefs '

Is truth preferable or the individual ? Are circumstances preferable or is truth preferable ? Acharya Bhikshu answered the above question He said, 'What I am saying today is untinged according to me If a polymath or metaphysician finds it wrong tomorrow, he should abandon it ' He never drew an absolute line beyond which truth did not exist Doing that would have meant presumptuousness.

We should consider all thoughts in the light of the fact that no word, language or substance can explain truth fully We should accept an idea as a qualified truth. Whatever comes complete is acceptable

The sun sets and darkness spreads everywhere In olden times oil lamps were used to light houses. Today electricity is used for the purpose There can be many sources of light and they can be quite compatible with one another But light is light. The sun gives light, so does the oil lamp Truth is no different. Whether expressed by an All-knowing person or by a petty person, truth is truth There is no difference There can be a difference in quantity

If you consider the whole process in a holistic context, I am sure you will not be deprived of peace of mind

Conclusion

'यदग्राह्यं न गृह्णाति गृहीतं नापि मुञ्चति ।
जानाति सर्वथा सर्वं, तत् स्वसंवेद्यमस्म्यहम् ॥'

Acharya Pujyapad explaining 'I' has said . 'I' is that who does not accept the unacceptable, does not give up the acceptable and knows everyone fully. 'I' does not exist where the unacceptable is accepted, the acceptable is given up and the partial is known

A nonviolent society has the same characteristics as 'I'. Conditions determining one's permanent nature are not to be renounced. It is conditions which gives rise to a particular state of mind that are to be renounced. Anything beyond 'I' has to be given up. This is what *Anuvrat* is

Question . During camps organized to practise *Anuvrat* discussions take place on agriculture, production, implements, etc Good food and drinks are served and people are well entertained Can this be regarded as spiritual practice ? Proportionately less attention is paid to meditation, observance of silence etc Are these camps places of spiritual practice or of amusement ?

Answer . Why is it believed that spritutal practice is possible only within traditionally accepted limits and not outside them ? Meditation, observance of silence and physical relaxation are indeed spiritual practices but are speaking, eating, drinking, sitting, standing not spiritual practices. Is good mutual behaviour not a spiritual practice ? If you think they are not, you have not at all understood the meaning of spiritual practice.

Once two rulers went hunting, riding their own chariots. The chariot of one of them burnt down, while the horse of the other died. Both became disabled and unselfreliant Returning from the forest become difficult. Both cooperated with each other One gave his chariot and the other his horse. A chariot was ready and riding it both returned

to the town. It is called *Dagdhashvarath Nyaya* (दग्धाश्वरथ न्याय). The same is true of spiritual practice In its fragmented or partial form it does not bear fruit or liberate the practitioner. The integrity of spiritual practice is questioned by those who insist that it is possible only in a particular place, at a particular time and through a particular activity and not otherwise. One of the incongruities of life is spending two hours in spiritual practice and the remaining twenty-two hours in non-spiritual pursuits

It does not help in creating faith in religion in the hearts of the people In fact, *Anuvrat* implies that there be no incongruity in life from the time one gets up in the morning till one goes to bed, and there be uniformity of spiritual practice at all times of day and night. *Anuvrat* manifests the nature of spiritual practice Even then in the phrase '*Anuvrat Sadhna Shivir*' (Camp for Anuvrat Spiritual Practice) the words 'spiritual practice' have been appended to *Anuvrat*. In Sanskrit grammar the word *Veepsa* is used which means *Vyaptumichcha*, i.e., the desire to permeate or extend In *Veepsa* saying the same word twice or four times is not considered a fault It is in this sense (of *Veepsa*) that the words 'spiritual practice' have been appended to *Anuvrat*.

Not that meditation, Yogic postures etc. are not essential But they alone do not constitute spiritual practice *Spiritual practice consists in remaining spiritully alert in what one does throughout the day* A man who stayed in the camp recently was very religious Earlier he used to practise with great faith meditation, silence etc for four to five hours But he was indifferent to good behaviour As a result his wife and all members of his inlaws' house were angry with him In fact, as a result of his behaviour, they developed a distaste for religion. A man cannot be religious if he is responsible for making others dislike it But his stay in the camp and practice of spirituality there changed his ideas about spiritual practice His life was transformed. As soon as he became alert about the rightness of his behaviour along with doing his spiritual practice and began to induct spirituality in everything he did, all around him became happy

It is in vain to believe in the possibility of doing meditation of life is devoid of humane behaviour, if ideas lack clarity and if one is full of perverted beliefs. It is a different matter if spiritual practice is viewed in a partial and fragmented manner. Fasting, meditation and observance of silence are means. The success of spiritual practice will be in proportion to the diminution of distance between means and ends. A *Sthitpragya* (person gifted with unshakable mental equilibrium)

discourses on various themes throughout the day, yet he is in reality silent. How can sitting tonguelessly under the spell of anger or confrontation be termed silence ? If it is, then even a heron can be called a meditator. Under this very illusion Ram praised the heron ·

'पश्य लक्ष्मण ! पपायां बकः परमधार्मिकः ।
दृष्ट्वा-दृष्ट्वा पद धत्ते जीवानां वधशंकया॥'

Hearing Ram say the above words a fish said

'बक. किं शस्यते राम ! येनाहं निष्कुलीकृतः ।
सहचारी विजानीयात्, चरित्रं सहचारिणाम्॥'

A sulky daughter-in-law went and sat down in a corner She did not eat at all Shall we call it fasting? Spiritual practice is neither in not doing something, nor in doing something It lies in inner awakening no matter whether accompanied with activity or inactivity

□ □